UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' GOAL ORIENTATIONS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO PARENTING STYLES

By
ALYSSA RENEE GONZALEZ

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1998

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am forever indebted to my committee chairman, Gordon Greenwood, for his time and patience and the wisdom to help me see the light of knowledge at the end of the tunnel. I would also like to acknowledge my doctoral committee, Barry Guinagh, Jin-Wen Hsu, and Greg Neimeyer, for their fastidious guidance and for always holding me to scholarly standards. Finally, I must thank my parents, Richard and Madeleine Gonzalez, for their unending support of my dreams and unswerving confidence in their "SuperGirl".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	1
Goal Orientations	2
Parenting Styles	4
Summary	11
Purpose of Study	12
Definition of Terms	12
Hypotheses	13
Significance of Study	14
Limitations of Study	15
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	16
Parenting Styles and College Academic Performance	17
Baumrind's Parenting Styles	18
General Parenting Practices	26
Parent Involvement and Parent Education	31
Parent Involvement	31
Parent Education	32
Goal Orientations and Achievement Behavior	34
Summary of Research	38
III. METHODOLOGY	40
Hypotheses	40
Research Participants	41
Procedure	41
Instrumentation	42
The Goals Inventory	42
Parental Authority Questionnaire	43
Background Information	44
Statistical Analyses	45

IV. RESULTS..... 50

Demographic Information..... 50
Statistical Analyses..... 52
Parenting Style Convergence..... 52
Regression Analyses..... 52
Results of Regression Analyses..... 59
Correlational Analyses..... 63
Summary..... 63
Tables..... 66

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS..... 76

Summary..... 76
Purpose of Study..... 76
Methodology..... 78
Results..... 78
Conclusions..... 81
Authoritarian Parenting..... 82
Authoritative Parenting..... 85
Permissive Parenting..... 87
Parent Involvement and Parent Education..... 90
Concluding Remarks..... 93
Future Directions..... 95

APPENDICES

A. INFORMED CONSENT..... 98
B. HOME SCHOOL INVENTORY..... 100
C. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL..... 104

REFERENCES..... 105

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH..... 112

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' GOAL ORIENTATIONS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO PARENTING STYLES

By

Alyssa Renee Gonzalez

August 1998

Chairman: Gordon Greenwood
Major Department: Foundations of Education

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among Baumrind's three parenting styles and the mastery and performance goal orientations of undergraduate college students. In addition, parent educational attainment and parent involvement were included in the analyses for the purposes of controlling the effects of these variables on student goal orientation. Student gender and ethnicity were investigated in order to determine whether the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation is different in these demographic groups.

The sample consisted of 311 undergraduate students enrolled in courses offered by the College of Education or the Psychology Department at the University of Florida. They completed a questionnaire that included the Goals Inventory and the Parental Authority Questionnaire.

Parental authoritarianism was related to student's performance orientation when investigating the combined effects of mother's and father's parenting styles. When considering the separate effects of each parent, father's authoritarianism in particular was significantly correlated with the performance orientation. However, this relationship was stronger among girls than boys. Also, parental authoritarianism was related to a student's mastery orientation among African Americans.

Parental authoritativeness was related to a student's mastery orientation when considering the combined effects of mother's and father's parenting style. When examining the separate effects of each parent, mother's authoritativeness in particular was related to a mastery orientation. While father's authoritativeness was related to a performance orientation, this relationship was weaker than the relationship between father's authoritarianism and a performance orientation. The relationship between authoritativeness and a mastery orientation was stronger for girls than boys. In addition, parental authoritativeness was related to a performance orientation among African Americans.

Only father's permissiveness was related to the performance orientation. This relationship was particularly evident among females.

Finally, parenting style was more strongly related to goal orientation than parent involvement or parent

education. However, parents' helping with homework was related to a performance orientation. Parent's attendance at school programs and extracurricular activities was related to a mastery orientation. Parent educational attainment was not significantly related to student goal orientation.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Educators are confronted on a daily basis with students who lack the necessary motivation to be successful in school. This has been a recurring concern in public education. The 1989 Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa poll of teacher attitudes showed lack of student interest as one of the top four mentioned problems in teaching (Elam, 1989). More recently, beginning teachers rated motivation as the area they are most in need of training (Barrett & Davis, 1995), and administrators nationwide rated student motivation as one of the main problems in education (Ritchie, 1990). Problems with student motivation are not exclusive to the public schools. Student apathy and lack of motivation are also a concern in college age students (Cohen, 1991; Cubbison, 1993; Gimenez, 1989; Kelly, 1988; Rice, 1994).

As a research area, motivation has experienced many shifts since its beginnings. Prior to the 1970s, need-drive theories, such as those proposed by Murray (Murray, Barrett, & Homburger, 1938) and Maslow (1954), were predominant. These theories describe motivation as developing from a need to reduce or fulfill inner tensions. In the 1970s locus of

control or attribution theories predominated. These theories examine the learner's beliefs regarding the causes of their successes and failures, and the ways in which these beliefs influence behavior. More recently, the study of students' goal orientations, or goal theory, is an area of student motivation that has drawn considerable interest. The goal orientation construct focuses on the types of learning goals that students' adopt in academic situations (Ames, 1992; Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988). It is from this latter body of literature that this study draws its focus.

Goal Orientations

In referring to goal orientations, Ames (1992) defines achievement goals as an "integrated pattern of beliefs, attributions, and affect that produces the intentions of behavior" and further adds, "that is represented by different ways of approaching, engaging in, and responding to achievement-type activities" (p. 261). The two goals that have received the most attention are mastery and performance goals. The following definitions of the mastery and performance orientations are based on descriptions proposed by Dweck and Leggett (1988).

Students who are oriented toward learning goals (i.e., mastery goals) are interested in learning new skills, improving their understanding and competence, and utilizing self-regulatory strategies. These students are concerned with improving their ability, and they seek challenges in

the learning process. Therefore, mastery goals are concerned with actual learning and understanding. Individuals with mastery goals believe that competence is malleable and controllable, are more likely to be intrinsically motivated to learn, view errors as opportunities to learn, and persist in the face of failure.

In contrast, students who orient towards a performance goal perspective are more concerned with proving their ability. These students are concerned with being judged able. Further, they believe that competence is a stable characteristic, are not as likely to be intrinsically motivated, view errors as a sign of failure, and give up easily when they fail. These students avoid opportunities for challenge.

Most of the early research on goal theory was conducted in elementary schools (Ames, 1984; Diener & Dweck, 1978; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988; Stipek & Kowalski, 1989). This body of research has led to the conclusion that mastery-oriented students display more adaptive achievement behaviors, while performance-oriented students evince maladaptive achievement behaviors.

Recently, research has begun to clarify the relationship between goal orientation and achievement behaviors in the college context (Archer, 1994; Hagen & Weinstein, 1995; Jagacinski & Nicholls, 1987; Pintrich & Garcia, 1991). These investigations have led researchers to

conclude that students in the college context are probably using both goal orientations simultaneously. The mere presence of performance goals does not necessarily lead to maladaptive achievement behaviors as long as mastery goals are salient. However, it is the adoption of mastery goals that leads to the most beneficial achievement behaviors. Therefore, the thrust of this research still emphasizes the superiority of mastery goals. The findings from the studies that have been conducted in the secondary schools produce similar conclusions (Ainley, 1993; Ames & Archer, 1988; Wentzel, 1989).

The goals students adopt relate to the way they approach potential learning situations. In effect, these goals relate to a student's motivational level for learning. In light of the concern for college students' motivation mentioned earlier, and given the recent research interest in college students' motivation likewise already mentioned, it seems important to look at the origin of goal orientations in undergraduates. Further, it may be argued that parenting styles in the home environment are strongly related to the development of motivational goal orientations. Therefore, parenting style may serve as a variable explaining the origins of motivational patterns in undergraduate achievement.

Parenting Styles

Recently, researchers have begun to speculate about the role that parental influence has on the formation of an

individual's motivational orientation. "It is imperative to study the family along with the school to understand contextual effects on student motivation and learning. Family structures and resulting practices have serious consequences for school behaviors that characterize successful students" (Epstein, 1989. p. 290). A prominent framework in the research on parental influence is Diana Baumrind's research on three prototypic parenting styles: (a) authoritative, (b) authoritarian, and (c) permissive. The following definitions are based on the definitions proposed by Baumrind (1971).

The authoritarian parenting style is associated with an emphasis on obedience and a tendency to favor more punitive measures of discipline management. These parents are more apt to demand absolute conformity from their children. They will allow for little give and take in discussions on rules of the home because they believe that their children should accept parental wishes as right. These parents believe in instilling a respect for authority and preservation of order in their children.

In contrast, authoritative parents tend to take the time to explain rules to their children and make more reasonable demands. They place less emphasis on strict obedience. They are more likely to encourage autonomy. They enforce rules consistently; yet they allow children to participate in family decision making. Therefore, these parents exhibit a respect for the rights and interests of

their children. However, they retain ultimate authority in decision making.

Finally, permissive parents use little apparent control over their children's behavior. They rarely use punishment in their homes. Clear rules are not set, and they make few demands concerning household responsibility and proper behavior. They allow the children to make their own decisions. These parents react in an accepting and affirmative manner to their child's wishes. They do not present themselves as individuals responsible for shaping the behavior of their children.

Following is a summary of the child behaviors related to each of Baumrind's three parenting styles (Baumrind, 1967, 1970, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Children from authoritarian homes tend to exhibit more anxious and withdrawn behavior. They have a high chance of relying on those in authority to make decisions; they are more dependent on these figures. Therefore they are less likely than those raised in authoritative homes to engage in exploratory and challenge seeking behavior. They are more likely to lack initiative, be unhappy, and to have low self-esteem. Further, Ginsburg and Bronstein (1993) have found a relationship between this style of parenting and an extrinsic motivation in children.

Children from authoritative homes are more willing to engage in exploratory behavior; they are more self-reliant.

They are more independent and curious. They tend to be academically motivated, and they generally feel confident in themselves. Ginsburg and Bronstein's (1993) results suggest a relationship between authoritative parenting and an intrinsic motivation toward learning; "autonomy-supporting family styles were associated with intrinsic motivation and higher academic performance" (Ginsburg & Bronstein, 1993, p. 1461).

Children from permissive homes usually lack self-control and self-reliance. They have little tolerance for frustration, and they are less likely to persist on learning tasks. They are more impulsive and less independent. They are more likely to be disobedient. Ginsburg and Bronstein (1993) have found permissive parenting to be related to lower academic performance and an extrinsic form of motivation.

Most of Baumrind's original research focused on preschool and early school age children (Baumrind, 1967, 1970, 1978; Baumrind & Black, 1967). Recently, researchers in the parenting styles literature have initiated investigation into adolescence (Baumrind, 1991; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992; Steinberg et al., 1994). These studies conclude that differences in adjustment associated with different parenting styles are either maintained or increase over time. For instance, they conclude authoritative parenting is associated with academic competence, self-reliance, and school engagement in

adolescent students. However, only one study was located that has been conducted to test the effects of parenting styles in the college years. Weiss and Schwarz (1996) found many of the expected relations between parenting style and children's personality, adjustment, and academic achievement. However, this study did not look at the relationship between parenting style and student motivation. Further, a thorough search of the literature failed to locate any research that attempts to explore the relationship between goal orientations, as presented earlier, and parenting styles regardless of the age of the student.

When exploring this relationship, there are some questions that would be of interest to look at based on previous research in the field. First, are there differences due to gender or ethnicity when investigating how goal orientations relate to parenting styles? Research on parenting has uncovered gender (Nutall & Nutall, 1976; Steinberg, Elmen & Mounts, 1989) and ethnic differences (Chao, 1994; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994).

In addition, some researchers have discussed parents' education as a source of influence on student achievement (Crane, 1996; McCartin & Meyer, 1988; Wang & Wildman, 1996; White, 1982) and parenting style (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987). It has also been

concluded that across a wealth of research, parent involvement generally benefits children's and adolescents' learning and academic success (Hoover-Dempsey & Sander, 1997, p. 3). Further, it has been reported that parent involvement predicts achievement more than that of parenting style (Paulson, 1994) and has even been proposed as a possible mediational influence between parenting style and school performance or engagement (Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). Therefore, it would be of further interest to study the relationship between parenting style and student goal orientation while controlling the effects of parental education and involvement.

Therefore, this study seeks to examine the relationships among Baumrind's three parenting styles and the goal orientations of undergraduate students. Support for such a study is drawn from a variety of sources.

1. In general, researchers have supported the notion that research needs to be done on the relationships between the home and the school when investigating academic outcomes like achievement and motivation (Grolnick & Ryan, 1992; Hess & Holloway, 1984).

2. Blumenfeld (1992), in her APA Centennial Feature, addressed some future directions of goal theory: "current thinking about goals would profit from classroom climate and cross-cultural research concerning the influence of teachers and parents on student motivation and learning" (p. 276).

3. Lamborn, Brown, Mounts, and Steinberg (1992) say that "Previous research has studied noninstructional influences on school performance and academic aspirations but has had very little to say about how family . . . affect(s) student engagement--the psychological investment in learning that takes place at school" (p. 156).

4. Grolnick and Ryan (1989), in their study on children's self-regulation, contend that "The relations between parental inputs and the nonintellective, inner resources that are involved in school adaptation remain an area that to date has been underexplored" (p. 143).

5. Epstein (1989) says "It is imperative to study the family along with the school to understand contextual effects on student motivation and learning. Family structures and resulting practices have serious consequences for school behaviors that characterize successful students" (Epstein, 1989. p. 290).

6. Weiss and Schwarz (1996) address the need to test the durability of the positive effects of varying parenting styles into the college years. They state that "authoritative parenting during the high school years may not necessarily continue into the college years, a time when parental support and prohibitions are less ubiquitous" (p. 2102).

Summary

The preceding rationale leads to the following conclusions of research.

1. Student motivation is a consistently reported problem by educators. In the effort to study student motivation, goal theory has drawn considerable interest as an area of inquiry.

2. Most of the research on goal theory has led to the conclusion that mastery goals, in contrast to performance goals, correlate with more adaptive achievement behaviors.

3. Researchers have begun to speculate about the role that parental influence has on the formation of an individual's motivation. Conclusions from the parenting styles research in the elementary and adolescent ages point to differences in adjustment associated with different parenting styles. Only one study was located that has looked at parental influence in the college years (Weiss & Schwarz, 1996). However, no research was located that specifically looked at the relationships among mastery and performance orientations and the three parenting styles as defined by Baumrind.

4. Parental education and involvement have also been discussed as sources of influence on academic achievement.

5. A number of individuals state the need for research exploring the relationship between parenting style and an individual's motivation, regardless of the student's age.

Purpose of Study

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships among the three parenting styles and the goal orientations of undergraduate college students. The following research questions need to be answered:

1. What relationships exist among Baumrind's three parenting styles and students' mastery and performance goal orientations when the effects of parent involvement and parent education are taken into account?

2. What differences exist among students of varying gender and ethnicity when looking at the relationship between goal orientation and parenting style?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, specific terms are operationally defined as follows.

Motivational/goal orientation, as measured by responses on the Goals Inventory (Roedel et al., 1994), refers to the two types of motivational goals that students adopt in learning situations: (1) mastery or (2) performance goals. While the terms are borrowed from the Ames (1992) perspective, these constructs are based on definitions proposed by Dweck and Leggett (1988), and they were presented earlier. As measured by the Goals Inventory, they are independent constructs. (Therefore, a high score on one goal scale does not necessarily indicate a low score on the other scale.) For clarification purposes, in the goal theory literature, mastery goals have also been called

"learning" (Dweck & Leggett, 1988) or "task-involved" (Nicholls, 1984) goals. Performance goals have been called "ego-involved" goals (Nicholls, 1984).

Parenting style, as measured by responses on the Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991), refers specifically to one of the three parenting styles: (a) authoritative, (b) authoritarian, or the (c) permissive style of parenting. These constructs are based on definitions proposed by Baumrind (1971) and were also presented earlier.

Hypotheses

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationships among the three parenting styles and the mastery and performance orientations of undergraduate college students. Following from the research questions presented previously, the null hypotheses of this study are as follows:

1. There will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when the effects of parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

2. There will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's performance orientation when the effects of parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

3. There will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's mastery

orientation when the effects of parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

4. There will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's performance orientation when the effects of parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

5. There will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when the effects of parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

6. There will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's performance orientation when the effects of parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

7. There will be no differences among students of varying ethnicity and gender when looking at the relationship between goal orientation and parenting style.

Significance of Study

It is important that research be conducted to examine the home variables that influence undergraduates' goal orientations. While this study focuses on college-age students, a literature gap exists in understanding parental influence on the goal orientations of students regardless of age.

This study is also significant in an applied sense. The results of this study will be of use to many individuals. College instructors interested in motivating

students should be aware that parenting style may be a possible source of influence on students' motivational orientation. In addition, the results of this study might be of use to personnel in college student advisement centers in discerning student motivational problems. Finally, this information might be disseminated, through adult education courses and texts, to parents who are interested in finding the most promising parenting practices in raising their children to become motivated young adults.

Limitations of Study

A fourth style of parenting has been mentioned in some of the recent parenting literature. Some research has indicated the need to distinguish between two types of permissive families: indulgent and rejecting/neglectful (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). Indulgent parents give their children more autonomy because they feel this is the best way to raise their children. In contrast, neglectful parents give their children more freedom because they are uninvolved in their children's lives. This study, however, will not examine this distinction because published instrumentation is not yet available for assessing all four constructs in the case of college-age students.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of the literature presented in this chapter is organized in the following way. First, literature most directly bearing on the research questions involved in this study will be presented. Unfortunately, there were no studies located that specifically looked at the relationships among mastery and performance orientations and Baumrind's parenting styles at any age level. Further, there was only one study located that has examined the relationship between Baumrind's parenting styles and academic performance in a college-age sample. As will be seen, the academic performance variable measured in that study is achievement and not a motivational construct.

Next, research has been done on the relationship between Baumrind's parenting styles and intrinsic motivation (a motivational construct related to the mastery orientation) among adolescents and young children. Specifically, such intrinsic motivational variables as student work/task orientation, self-regulation, intrinsic motivation, and the approach versus avoidance tendency have been studied. This literature will therefore be presented second.

Third, the literature less directly bearing on the present study will be summarized. These studies will examine the relationship between general parenting practices (other than the framework proposed by Baumrind) and intrinsic motivational variables.

Fourth, research discussing the influence of parent involvement and parent education on academic performance will be presented. These studies will clarify the importance of including these additional home variables in analyses that examine the relationship between parenting style and student goal orientation.

Finally, research that explores the relationships between mastery and performance orientations and achievement behavior will be presented. This section will clarify the importance of studying the origins of motivational patterns by showing the influence goal orientations can have on the way students approach learning activities.

Throughout this chapter, the research conducted with older students will be presented initially, followed by investigations with younger children. This is due to the present study's focus on college undergraduates.

Parenting Styles and College Academic Performance

Only one study was located that looked at the relationship between Baumrind's parenting styles and college students' academic performance. Weiss and Schwarz (1996) conducted a study on the relationship between parenting practices and older students' personality, school

achievement, adjustment, and substance abuse. These students were a subset selected from a larger study examining family conflicts and adolescent adjustment. The sample included 178 university freshmen and the variables of interest included parenting style (based on an extended version of Baumrind's framework using the Child Report of Parental Behavior Inventory [CRPBI]) and academic achievement (grade point average and scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test [SAT]).

While results indicated that although authoritative parenting was associated with more favorable scores on the previously mentioned achievement variables most of the time, the scores were not large enough to distinguish them from other parenting types. However, the researchers report that "nevertheless, the differences in outcome between the present study and others are, for the most part, of degree but not of kind" (p. 2110). Those characteristics that distinguished children raised with different styles of parenting were also present in students of college-age. Therefore, while the researchers failed to find the magnitude of differences previously reported, many of the predicted relations between parenting style and student behavior were found.

Baumrind's Parenting Styles

While Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, and Fraleigh (1987) did not examine the variable of student motivation, they did investigate the relationships among

parenting style, parental education, and academic performance in adolescents. Approximately 7,836 adolescents completed a questionnaire that was developed to assess demographic background (for instance ethnicity and parental education), parenting style (based on Baumrind typology), and student performance (grades and grade point average). In general, results indicated that authoritative parenting was associated with better grades compared to authoritarian and permissive parenting styles (across gender, age, parental education, and ethnicity). An important finding of this study was families with higher parental education were associated with lower authoritarianism and permissiveness; parental education was a powerful predictor of achievement. And further, they cited that Baumrind's framework "can successfully be applied to adolescents and related to their academic performance in high school" (p. 1255).

Steinberg, Elmen, and Mounts (1989) investigated the effects of authoritative parenting on adolescents' psychosocial maturity and academic achievement. The participants of this study included 120 families with a child between the ages of 11 and 16. The sample consisted of families from a predominately white, middle-class background. Authoritative parenting was measured through adolescent perceptions using the CRPBI. This instrument measures the degree of acceptance and psychological autonomy parents use in raising their children.

Behavioral control was measured by a checklist of items designed to assess the degree to which adolescents perceived they were involved in family decision making in the home. The subscales of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr and Knerr, 1974) were (a) work orientation (work skills, aspirations for competent work performance, and capacity to experience pleasure in work), (b) self-reliance (absence of excessive dependence on others, perceived control in one's life, and initiative), and (c) identity (self-esteem, concern with life goals, internalization of values). Academic performance was measured through official record of school grades and scores on the California Achievement Tests.

Results indicated that authoritative parenting promotes academic success. Specifically, youngsters who describe their parents as nurturing greater psychological autonomy, exercising firmer behavioral control, and who were more accepting did better in school. (A gender effect was observed in that the positive impact of parental acceptance appeared stronger upon girls, while behavioral control seemed stronger for boys. Further, the beneficial effects of psychological autonomy and behavioral control appear stronger with older adolescents in comparison to the younger adolescents in the sample.) More important for the purposes of this study, this finding is mediated partly by the effects of authoritativeness on the development of healthy sense of psychosocial maturity (especially a sense of

self-reliance and a healthy orientation toward work). "In any event, it appears from these analyses that the most direct psychosocial mechanism through which authoritative parenting may encourage school success is though the effects of such parenting practices on youngsters' work orientation" (p. 1433).

Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, and Dornbusch (1991) investigated the relationship among parenting styles based on Baumrind and patterns of adolescent competence and adjustment. Approximately 10,000 ninth-through twelfth-grade students were included as participants in this study. Data were collected through the use of a self-report questionnaire. Of relevance to this study, the investigators collected information on the students' (a) parenting style (with items developed to approximate Baumrind typology), (b) psychosocial development (work orientation and self-reliance constructs of previous listed study), (c) academic achievement (grade point average, self-perceived academic competence, and attachment to school), and (d) demographic information (on participants' gender, ethnicity, and parental education).

Results showed that adolescents who were raised in an authoritative home showed the highest scores on psychosocial and academic competence. Of most importance to this study, adolescents from authoritative homes on average scored the highest on the work orientation (which represents pride in successful completion of tasks), and self-reliance

(representing perceived internal control and ability to engage in decision-making without extreme reliance on others). Also, the investigators failed to find an interaction between students of varying gender, ethnicity, parent education, and socioeconomic status with variables presented here. This shows that the benefits of being raised in an authoritative home cut across demographic groups.

Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, and Darling (1992) longitudinally investigated the impact of parenting style, parental involvement, and parental encouragement on academic achievement and engagement. Approximately 6,400 adolescents (14 to 18 years-old) from a previous study reported on the parenting style they perceived their parents used. These participants came from an ethnically and socioeconomically diverse population. Items were developed to assess academic outcomes. Variables of relevance to this study were self-reported grade point average, time spent on homework, classroom engagement, and school orientation (commitment to school). Over the course of two years, data were collected on the adolescents' academic performance and engagement. The parenting measure that was used was developed to measure the authoritative parenting style as perceived by the adolescent. Parental involvement was measured by items developed to assess the adolescents' perception of parent being involved in homework help, attending school programs/extracurricular activities, course selection, and

staying abreast of student academic progress. Parental encouragement was measured by items developed to assess adolescent perception of the extent to which parents communicate the value of doing well in school.

Results indicated that adolescents raised in authoritative homes led to better academic performance and stronger school engagement. These findings cut across gender, age, social groups, but not ethnicity. Parenting style showed less of an influence on academic achievement among African-Americans. Interestingly, however, this study also concluded that the positive effect on achievement is mediated (or accounted for) by the beneficial influence of authoritative parenting on parental involvement. Parental encouragement of academic achievement did not play a significant role influencing achievement/engagement once involvement was taken into account.

Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, and Dornbusch (1994) studied changes across time in adolescent adjustment/competence associated with Baumrind's parenting styles. Participants in this study were approximately 2,300 adolescents, ranging from 14 to 18 years-old, from a previous study the investigators had conducted one year prior. Adolescents' self-reported responses of perceptions of parenting style were measured using an index designed to approximate Baumrind's parenting typology. A four parenting style typology resulted: authoritative, neglectful, authoritarian, and indulgent. The outcome variables

measured of interest to this study were psychosocial development which assesses social competence (subscale of the Adolescent Self-Perception Profile, Harter, 1982), work orientation, and self-reliance (two subscales from Greenberger's Psychosocial Maturity Inventory). Academic achievement measured perceived academic competence (Adolescent Self-Perception Profile, Harter, 1982), grade point average, and attachment to school (items developed by investigators). Information on students' gender, ethnicity, year in school, and parental education were also collected.

Results of this 1-year follow-up indicated that differences in adjustment related to different parenting styles were maintained or increase over time. Individuals raised in authoritative homes showed clear advantages in psychosocial and academic competence. Individuals raised in neglectful homes showed the poorest outcomes, and there were mixed outcomes from those raised in indulgent or authoritarian homes. Ethnic differences showed up with the authoritative parenting style; its relation to these beneficial outcomes (psychosocial development and academic achievement) appears to be strongest among European American youth. In relation to grade point average, academic self-concept, and school orientation, the authoritarian parenting style seemed more advantageous among Asian-American youth, and parenting style was unrelated to academic competence in African-Americans.

Finally, in a landmark study, Baumrind (1967) investigated the parenting practices anteceding patterns of preschool behavior. Thirty-two 3 and 4-year olds enrolled at the Child Care Center, Institute of Human Development at the University of California, were chosen to participate in this study. They were from a predominantly middle class, well educated population in an urban university community. These children fell into three behavioral patterns based on extensive investigator observation at the children's nursery school and later laboratory observation: Pattern I (self-reliant, self-controlled, explorative or a tendency to approach challenge, and had a content, subjective mood), Pattern II (discontent, withdrawn, and distrustful), and Pattern III (little self-control or self-reliance and tended to retreat from novel experiences). The parental variables were measured using a combination of home visit sequence analysis, structured observation, interviews, and responses on the Parent Behavior Rating Scale (PBRS). Parental variables that were measured included parental control, parental maturity demands, parent-child communication, and parental nurturance.

Results indicated that parents of pattern I children (later termed the authoritative parenting style) were loving, and respective of the child's independent decisions (and yet showed the ability to firmly stand on a stated position). They were more likely to accompany a directive with a reason and to balance high nurturance with high

control. In contrast, parents of pattern II children (authoritarian) were less nurturant and exerted firm control and used power freely. They did not encourage the child to express him or herself and were more likely to give an absolute moral imperative. Finally, parents of pattern III children (permissive) behaved in a less controlling manner, were less organized in running their household, and used love in a manipulative way.

General Parenting Practices

Nutall and Nutall (1976) studied the relationship between parent-child relationships and effective academic motivation. Teenagers enrolled in junior high or senior high (233 boys and 300 girls) were included in the sample. This sample consisted predominantly of white, middle-class individuals. The investigators assessed parent-child relationships with Schaefer's (1965) CRPBI (Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory). This instrument measure three main parenting factors: hostile psychological control, acceptance versus rejection, and lax discipline versus firm control. Academic motivation was measured with the TEAM (Test of Effective Academic Motivation) developed by Smith (1970). This is a self-report measure which assessed the degree to which students were obedient/law-abiding, work hard and effectively, feel capable, confident academically, self-sufficient, like school and intellectual activities, and are ambitious.

Results showed that males who were raised by parents low on hostile psychological control, accepting, and firm with discipline were higher in academic achievement traits. This parenting type has much in common with the authoritative parenting style. Females raised in homes low on hostile psychological control and that were high in acceptance were associated with achievement traits. Researchers concluded "in general, it was found that children who had parents who tended not to use hostile psychological control techniques and who accepted their children more, tended to have more achievement motivated children" (Nutall & Nutall, 1976, p. 11-12). This was especially true for the motivational dimension of works hard and effectively.

Paulson (1994) studied the relation between parenting style and involvement with adolescent achievement. The sample consisted of 247 ninth-grade students and their parents. Participants were predominantly white, so results cannot be generalized to other ethnic groups. Through a developed questionnaire, the investigator measured both student and parents' perceptions of parental demandingness, responsiveness, involvement and demographic variables (age, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status). Adolescents reported their grades. Results indicated that, across gender, adolescent (not parental) perception of parenting style predicted achievement outcome. Of particular interest, these researchers concluded that "parental involvement

significantly predicted achievement above and beyond dimensions of parenting styles" (p. 250). However, the investigator also pointed out that high levels of parent involvement are more likely in authoritative homes.

Grolnick and Ryan (1989) studied the parenting styles associated with self-regulation and academic competence in children (grades three through six). Sixty-six children and their parents from a predominantly Caucasian, middle class background were the participants for this study. Investigators assessed three aspects of parenting practices (autonomy support, structure/guidelines, and parental involvement) through parent interviews. The child outcomes of interest to this study that were measured were children's ratings of (a) self-regulation (ASRQ, Academic Self-Regulation Questionnaire, Connell & Ryan, 1986),(b) perceived control (Multidimensional Measure of Children's Perceptions of Control [MMPC], Connell, 1985), and (c) school competence. School competence was measured through academic grades, scores on different standardized achievement tests, teachers' responses on the Teacher Rating Scale developed for this study, and perceived competence, (Perceived Competence Scale, Harter, 1982).

Results indicated that parental autonomy support was related to children's self-regulation, teacher-rated competence and achievement. Since autonomy support is a focal characteristic of authoritative parenting, this is important to the present study. Also, self-regulation,

defined as "the process of setting standards and goals for oneself and engaging in behaviors that enable one to meet those standards and goals" (Ormrod, 1995, p.G-7) has clear similarities with a mastery orientation to learning.

Grolnick, Ryan, and Deci (1991) looked at motivation as a possible mediator between children's perceptions of parenting and school achievement. There were 456 children ranging from grades three through six participating in this study. This sample consisted predominantly of white children, with a range of socioeconomic statuses. Using a questionnaire they developed, the investigators collected data on children's perceptions of parenting (autonomy support and parental involvement). Three aspects of motivation were also measured: children's perceptions of control (MMPC), perceived competence (Self-Perception Profile for children, Harter, 1985), and self-regulation (Self-Regulation Scale developed by Ryan and Connell, 1989). Teachers also provided students' classroom grades, scores on different achievement tests, and teacher ratings of student academic competence, motivation, and independence.

Results indicated that children raised with more paternal autonomy support and parental involvement had a greater degree of perceived competence and autonomy. Maternal autonomy support and involvement were related to all three motivational constructs. In turn, the three motivational constructs were predictors of academic performance.

Ginsburg and Bronstein (1993) investigated family factors related to children's intrinsic/extrinsic motivation and academic performance. Participants included 93 fifth-grade children and their parents. The investigators used both self-report (Intrinsic versus Extrinsic Motivational Orientation in the Classroom, Harter, 1980) and teacher report (items developed from the Inferred Self-Concept Scale, McDaniel, 1973) to assess students' motivation. School performance was measured though the use of academic grades and achievement scores on the Stanford Achievement Test. Finally, a scale was developed to assess the family factors of parental report of surveillance of homework and students' perceived parental reactions to grades. Parent and student perceived family styles were measured using Bloom's Self-Report Measure of Family Functioning (1985). They also measured participants' socioeconomic status, parental estimate of family income, and occupational prestige.

Results of this study found that higher parental surveillance of homework, parental reactions to grades that included negative forms of control, parental uninvolvement, or extrinsic reward, and over- (authoritarian, enmeshed) and undercontrolling family styles (external locus of control and laissez-faire) were related to an extrinsic motivational orientation and lower academic achievement. In contrast, parental encouragement in response to grades and autonomy supporting family styles (democratic, expressive) were

related to an intrinsic motivational orientation and higher academic achievement. This latter type of parenting is very similar to the authoritative parenting style.

Parent Involvement and Parent Education

In addition to some of the previously mentioned studies' discussion on parent involvement and parent education, this section will provide a brief review of the research on the influence of these home variables on student academic performance.

Parent Involvement

Greenwood and Hickman (1991) summarize research on parent involvement. They cite numerous studies that found relationships between parent involvement and such student variables as: academic achievement, student sense of well-being, student attendance, student attitude, homework readiness, grades, and educational aspirations. They cite further research that concludes that types of parental involvement correlate with academic achievement while controlling for differences in ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Finally they mention the famous Coleman Report of 1966 that cites that "approximately one-half to two-thirds of the student achievement variance studied was accounted for by home variables" (p. 279).

White, Taylor, and Moss (1992), reviewed 172 studies examining the claims about the benefits of parental involvement in early intervention programs. While this investigation was focused exclusively on disadvantaged

children, "this analysis shows that there is no convincing evidence that the ways in which parents have been involved in previous early intervention research studies result in more effective outcomes" (p. 91). The researchers do state that problems discerning effectiveness of parent involvement program implementation, inadequacies of measurement tools, and poorly designed research could account for this lack of finding positive effects.

"Across a range of studies, there has emerged a strong conclusion that parental involvement in child and adolescent education generally benefits children's learning and school success (e.g. Chavkin, 1993; Eccles & Harold, 1993; Epstein, 1989, 1991, 1994; Hess & Holloway, 1984; Hobbs et al., 1984; U.S. Department of Education, 1994)" (Hoover-Dempsey & Sander, 1997, p. 3). However, no research was located which examined what effects the influence of parental involvement during the public school years has on student academic performance into the college years.

Parent Education

Parent education or socioeconomic status is another source home variable that has been presented as an influence on student academic performance. Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown (1992) emphasize the "strong association between parental social class and scholastic success in the sociological literature on status attainment" (p. 725). Traditionally, parents' education has been used as a measure of socioeconomic status.

McCartin and Meyer (1988) studied the role of family variables in adolescent achievement and college plans. Over 4,500 high school students participated in this study. The researchers had concluded that they did find correlations that conformed to the previous finding concerning socioeconomic status, parental occupations, and parental educational attainment. However, these correlations were much lower than reported in other findings.

Wang, Wildman, and Calhoun (1996) investigated the relationships between parental influence and academic achievement in seventh grade mathematics. They conducted a regression analysis of national data comprised of 3000 seventh graders. Trough a backward elimination procedure, mothers' and fathers' education were selected as significant variables related to student achievement.

Crane (1996) investigated the effects of home environment, SES, and maternal test scores on achievement in mathematics on children between the ages of five and nine. Results indicated that all three factors significantly affected mathematics achievement. However, home environment (referring to the quality of the relationship between parents and child, stimulating toys and physical environment, age of weaning, if parents had read to children) had a sizable impact on math achievement when SES and maternal test scores were controlled. In addition, the effects of parent education disappeared when home environment and maternal test scores were controlled. This

study even made conclusions concerning the isolation of the impact of genetics, "no more than 25% of the overall relationship between mothers' and children's' scores is genetic, whereas at least 75% works through environmental mechanisms" (p. 312).

Goal Orientations and Achievement Behavior

This section will provide a brief review of the research on goal orientations and their impact on academic behaviors. Most of the research on goal theory has led to the conclusion that mastery goals, in contrast to performance goals, correlate with more adaptive achievement behaviors.

Jagacinski and Nicholls (1987) studied the impact of a performance goal on the perceived competence and general positive affect of 162 introductory psychology students. They concluded that "in a task-involving context, the mere availability of social comparison information does not significantly decrease the positive affects that accompany effortful success" (p. 113). Therefore, while the mere presence of a performance goal does not have a negative effect on achievement behavior, it is the salience of a mastery goal orientation that is associated with the more adaptive achievement behaviors.

Pintrich and Garcia (1991) investigated the relationship between student goal orientation and self-regulation of 263 undergraduates. They report that an extrinsic orientation may be necessary when an intrinsic

motivation is not present, and they found that students who were employing performance goals reported better cognitive engagement than those with no goals whatsoever. However, they state, "a general orientation to learning and mastery goals at the beginning of a course helps student maintain positive motivational beliefs about their capabilities and their interest in the course . . . an intrinsic orientation to learning is clearly linked to the use of cognitive strategies like elaboration and organization that result in deeper processing of the course material" (p.396).

Archer (1994) conducted a study that analyzed the relationship between goal orientations and achievement behaviors of 893 college freshmen. Students who operated under a mastery goal orientation used more learning strategies, had a more positive attitude, and tackled harder tasks. These students were less concerned with protecting their sense of self-worth. Further, Archer's analyses found simultaneous orientation towards both types of goals led to the previously mentioned adaptive achievement patterns. However, even though significant relationships were found between performance goals and achievement behaviors, "the strength of these relationships was less strong than those with a mastery goal" (p. 443).

Hagen and Weinstein (1995) in their review of research in this field, discuss the importance of the classroom context on student goals. They mention "while students often have both mastery and performance goals, it seems

clear that emphasizing mastery goals in college classrooms is beneficial to students" (p. 51). These researchers state that mastery goals are consistently related to adaptive achievement behaviors like self-regulation strategies and the selection of challenging tasks. Therefore, while acknowledging that both goals may be present in students, it is the mastery goals college educators should nurture.

Ames and Archer (1988) conducted a study in which they investigated the relationship between the use of mastery or performance goals and motivational patterns. The sample consisted of 176 students in grades 8-11. Results indicated that when students perceived their classrooms as facilitating a mastery orientation, they were involved in the task and challenged themselves, utilized more learning strategies, and had more positive attitudes towards the class. However, the mere presence of performance goals did not inhibit some aspects of achievement behaviors when mastery goals were salient.

However, most of the early research on goal theory was conducted in elementary schools. Dweck (1986) and Dweck and Leggett (1988) provide a review of the findings of goal orientation research done with younger children (prior to adolescence). Students with mastery goals seek out challenge and persist in the face of difficulty. These students view errors as opportunities to learn, to increase their effort, and restrategize. Children are focused on effort to successfully complete a task and experience pride

and satisfaction with their accomplishment. Therefore, they see competence as malleable. They tend to choose challenging tasks even if they perceive their ability for those tasks to be low. They are more likely to be intrinsically motivated to learn.

In contrast, Dweck (1986) and Dweck and Leggett (1988) state that students with performance goals see intelligence as a fixed trait. They tend not to select challenging tasks in an effort to avoid negative evaluations. They are less likely to be intrinsically motivated to learn. For these students, satisfaction is based on the ability they have displayed rather then the effort involved to achieve mastery. They are focused on issues of ability. Errors indicate failure and lack of ability. Therefore, they tend to withdraw when the encounter these obstacles.

In summary, research conducted among younger children does not discuss the use of simultaneous goals and just emphasizes the positive achievement behaviors associated with the adoption of mastery goals. The results from research conducted with older students indicate that students in the college context are probably using both goals simultaneously, although the adoption of mastery goals is associated with the most beneficial achievement behaviors. Therefore, the thrust of the goal orientation research emphasizes the superiority of mastery goals.

It may be argued that parenting styles in the home environment are strongly related to the development of goal

orientations in undergraduates as well as younger children. Therefore, parenting style may serve as a variable explaining the origins of motivational patterns in undergraduate achievement.

Summary of Research

1. The studies looking at the relationship between Baumrind's parenting styles and student motivation (at various ages) found that characteristics of authoritative parenting (in comparison to the authoritarian and permissive styles) are correlated with such motivational behaviors as: self-reliance, tendency to approach new tasks, capacity to experience pleasure in work, self-regulation, intrinsic motivation and general engagement/commitment to school. These motivational characteristics are major components of a mastery orientation to learning.

2. Research is inconclusive concerning an interaction between ethnicity, Baumrind's parenting styles, and student motivation. Some report that the beneficial outcomes associated with authoritative parenting appear to be strongest among European American/Caucasian youth (in comparison to Asian or Africa Americans). Others find the beneficial outcomes of authoritative parenting cut across different ethnic groups.

3. Research is also inconclusive concerning an interaction between gender, Baumrind's parenting styles, and student motivation. Some research indicates that males and females may benefit more from certain parenting practices

(characteristic of the authoritative parenting style) in comparison to each other. Other researchers find the positive benefits of authoritative parenting cut across gender groups.

4. Research indicates that parental involvement and parental education both positively influence academic achievement. Further, one study concluded that parent involvement accounted for the positive effects of authoritative parenting on academic achievement. However, little research has been conducted that looks at the effects of parenting style on student motivation while controlling for the influences of parental involvement and parental education.

5. A brief review of the research on goal orientations and their impact on academic behaviors was provided. The majority of this research has led to the conclusion that mastery goals, in contrast to performance goals, correlate with more adaptive achievement behaviors.

6. In conclusion, no research was located that specifically looked at the relationships among mastery and performance orientations and the three parenting styles as defined by Baumrind at any age level. However, Weiss and Schwarz (1996) conducted a study among undergraduates and found authoritative parenting was associated with more favorable academic achievement scores.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among the three parenting styles and the mastery and performance goal orientations of undergraduate college students.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

2. There will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

3. There will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

4. There will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's performance

orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

5. There will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

6. There will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

7. There will be no differences among students of varying gender and ethnicity when looking at the relationship between goal orientation and parenting style.

Research Participants

The sample for this study consisted of 311 undergraduate students who attend the University of Florida. Specifically, this study focused on students enrolled in courses offered by the College of Education or the Psychology Department. The university represents a diverse student population of varying gender and ethnicity. The researcher collected information on both of these demographic variables in order to analyze differences between these groups when looking at the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation.

Procedure

The data were collected by means of a questionnaire. This questionnaire was a combination of the Goals Inventory (Roedel, Schraw, & Plake, 1994) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991). In addition, a brief background

information sheet was attached to the questionnaire in order to assess demographic variables. The questionnaires were given out during a scheduled class period. Students were offered an extra credit incentive for their participation in this study. Participants were allowed to take the questionnaire home to complete. However, they were notified that the investigator was to return at the beginning of the next two class sessions to collect completed questionnaires.

When participants returned the questionnaires, they provided their names and social security numbers on a sign-in sheet. This sheet was immediately given to the course instructor in order to distribute extra credit. Students did not identify themselves on the informed consent or questionnaire. This way the investigator was not able to link the student to their responses on the questionnaire. Therefore, confidentiality was assured because participants' responses were anonymous.

Instrumentation

The Goals Inventory

This inventory, developed by Roedel et al. (1994), is designed to measure older students' mastery and performance orientations. It contains 25 items using a 5-point Likert scale for each item. It has two scales, and it yields two separate continuous scores. One represents an individual's score on the mastery orientation, and one represents a score on the performance orientation. These two scales are statistically independent and are uncorrelated. Roedel et

al. report respectable reliability and validity estimates for this instrument. The test-retest reliability estimates for the mastery and performance scales were r=.73 and r=.76 respectively. Internal consistency estimates were .80 and .75 respectively, using Cronbach's alpha. Adequate convergent and divergent validity conclusions were supported by comparing this instrument with other important constructs. The Goals Inventory takes approximately seven minutes to complete.

The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)

The PAQ, developed by Buri (1991), is designed to measure Baumrind's authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting styles. It contains 30 items using a 5-point Likert scale for each item and is appropriate for use with older students. This instrument measures both parents, and it has three scales for each parenting style. Therefore, it yields six separate and continuous scores for each participant. Scores of the three parenting styles are correlated. In addition, mothers' and father's scores are also correlated.

Buri reports favorable reliability and validity estimates on this instrument. Test-retest reliability estimates were r=.81 for mother's permissiveness, r=.86 for mother's authoritarianism, r=.78 for mother's authoritativeness, r=.77 for father's permissiveness, r=.85 for father's authoritarianism, and r=.92 for father's authoritativeness. Cronbach's alpha was used to obtain the

following internal consistency reliability estimates: .75 for mother's permissiveness, .85 for mother's authoritarianism, .82 for mother's authoritativeness, .74 for father's permissiveness, .87 for father's authoritarianism, and .85 for father's authoritativeness. The PAQ also shows respectable discriminant validity (leads to divergent responses on items from the three scales) and criterion-related validity (ability to measure parenting behavior on related variable of parental warmth). The PAQ takes approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Background Information

In addition to the aforementioned instruments, the questionnaire the participants completed had a background information section. This section asked for information pertaining to participants' gender, ethnicity, age, program of study, and class standing. In addition, participants completed items pertaining to parent involvement and parent education in order to control for the effects of these variables on the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation. The following is an explanation of the preceding variables that are not otherwise obvious.

Program of study. This nominal variable refers to the participant's major. It will only be analyzed for descriptive purposes in order to discuss the nature of the sample's academic interests.

Class standing. This dichotomous variable refers to whether the participant is an undergraduate or graduate

student. Because this study will only focus on undergraduate students, this questionnaire item will allow for the researcher to control for only undergraduate students responses to be included in the statistical analyses.

Parent involvement. This continuous variable refers to the frequency with which parents were involved in students' public school education (helping with student's homework, attending school programs, attending athletic or extracurricular events, helping student choose academic courses, and keeping informed on how student is doing in school).

Parent education. This rank order variable refers to level of education students' parents have attained (graduate or professional degree; 4-year college degree; some college or vocational/trade school; high school graduate; not a high school graduate; don't know).

Statistical Analyses

The data were analyzed using correlational methods and the analyses proceeded in four steps. First, product-moment correlations were used to analyze the relationship between the parenting style scores for mothers and fathers to assure a high rate of convergence (e.g., .75). Because of the inclusion of so many parent variables, a correlation matrix of the variables of parenting style, parent involvement, parent education, and goal orientations was computed to analyze the intercorrelations.

Secondly, multiple regression analyses were performed on the mastery and performance orientations to investigate the relationship between these goal orientations and Baumrind's parenting styles. Parent involvement and parent education will be included in these regression analyses for the purposes of controlling the effects of these variables on student goal orientations. A p-value of less than .05 was used to determine statistical significance with all analyses.

These regression analyses were performed to assess the combined (or averaged) effects of (a) mother's and father's parenting style, (b) all five types of parental involvement, and (c) mother's and father's education. This procedure was chosen based on a trend in the literature that reports a high rate of convergence between mother's and father's parenting style and therefore considers the joint effect for parents (Baumrind, 1991; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992; and Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). This procedure was also chosen in case of the possibility of high intercorrelations among the five types of parent involvement and mother's and father's education. These analyses are represented by general regression models 1 and 2 and are defined on the next page.

Thirdly, an additional set of regression analyses were performed to examine the independent effects of mother's and father's parenting style, each type of parent involvement,

and father's and mother's educational level. In the event that the intercorrelations of the previously mentioned variables was low, these analyses were chosen to allow for the examination of the separate effects of mother's and father's parenting style, each type of parent involvement, and mother's and father's education. A stepwise selection procedure was employed for these analyses because any variables that were included would later be dropped from the model if they lost their usefulness. This would result in a more efficient model with all independent variables contributing to the explanation of variance. These regression analyses are represented by the stepwise selection models 3 and 4 and are defined on the following pages.

Finally, separate regression analyses were performed on each group that differs by gender and ethnicity. These regression analyses were performed to determine whether the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation is different in various demographic groups. These regression analyses were also analyzed by using general models 1 and 2.

<u>Model 1</u>

$MO = A + B_1ATV + B_2PERM + B_3ATN + B_4PI + B_5PE + B_6GEND + B_7ETH + E$

<u>Model 2</u>

$PO = A + B_1ATV + B_2PERM + B_3ATN + B_4PI + B_5PE + B_6GEND + B_7ETH + E$

where MO= Mastery orientation

PO= Performance orientation

ATV= Parental authoritativeness

PERM= Parental permissiveness

ATN= Parental authoritarianism

PI= Parental Involvement

PE= Parents' Education

GEND= Student Gender

ETH= Student Ethnicity

Model 3

$MO= A +B_1ATVM +B_2ATVF +B_3PERMM +B_4PERMF +B_5ATNM +B_6ATNF +B_7PIA +B_8PIB +B_9PIC +B_{10}PID +B_{11}PIE +B_{12}FE +B_{13}ME +B_{14}GEND +B_{15}ETH +E$

Model 4

$PO= A +B_1ATVM +B_2ATVF +B_3PERMM +B_4PERMF +B_5ATNM +B_6ATNF +B_7PIA +B_8PIB +B_9PIC +B_{10}PID +B_{11}PIE +B_{12}FE +B_{13}ME +B_{14}GEND +B_{15}ETH +E$

where MO= Mastery orientation

PO= Performance orientation

ATVM= Mother's authoritativeness

ATVF= Father's authoritativeness

PERMM= Mother's permissiveness

PERMF= Father's permissiveness

ATNM= Mother's authoritarianism

ATNF= Father's authoritarianism

PIA= Helping students with homework

PIB= Attending school programs

PIC= Attending sports/extracurricular activities

PID= Helping students select courses

PIE= Knowledge of student's academic progress

FE= Father's Education

ME= Mother's Education

GEND= Student Gender

ETH= Student Ethnicity

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among the three parenting styles and the mastery and performance goal orientations of undergraduate college students. The variables of parent involvement and parent education were included in these analyses for the purposes of controlling the effects of these variables on student goal orientations. In addition, student gender and ethnicity were also included in order to see whether the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation is different in various demographic groups.

Demographic Information

The sample consisted of 311 undergraduates enrolled in courses offered by the College of Education or the Psychology Department at the University of Florida. Of these students, 234 were female and 77 were male. With regards to ethnicity, 236 were non-Hispanic Caucasian, 24 were Hispanic, 11 were Asian American, and 30 were African American. There were 10 students who did not classify themselves exclusively into one ethnic category but as a mixture of various ethnicities. Throughout the remainder of this study, the term Caucasian refers to students of

non-Hispanic descent. The mean age of the students participating in this study was 21, with the majority (89%) being between 18 and 22. Students in this sample came from a range of academic programs and majors.

With the variable of parents' educational attainment, 81 fathers and 55 mothers had obtained a graduate/professional degree, 83 fathers and 78 mothers had finished four years of college, 83 fathers and 103 mothers had attended some college or vocational/trade school, 43 fathers and 62 mothers were at least high school graduates, and 17 fathers and 13 mothers were not at least high school graduates. There were four participants who did not know their fathers' level of educational attainment.

Most of the students reported that their parents were usually involved in their education growing up. Specifically, 77% of students said their parents usually helped them with their homework, 67% of students reported that their parents usually attended school programs, and 73% said their parents were usually knowledgeable of their academic progress. However, only 36% said their parents usually helped them select their courses for school.

Finally, means and standard deviations of both parents' scores on the authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive subscales are provided in Table 1. These averages are comparable to norms established for college-age students in the original validation of the Parental Authority Questionnaire.

Statistical Analyses

Parenting Style Convergence

Individual correlations were calculated between parents for each item of the PAQ (which contained 30 items per parent). Twenty-eight of the 30 correlations were significant at $p < .0001$. These correlations ranged from $r=.175$ to $r=.488$. The average of these correlations was $r=.3479$. In addition, the correlations were calculated between parents on each of the three parenting styles (see Table 10). In general, it was shown that many of the scores yielded by the PAQ are intercorrelated. In particular, mother's and father's scores were significantly correlated within each style of parenting.

Regression Analyses

Therefore, while the correlations within each parenting style were statistically significant, the correlations between parents on individual items was lower than expected. However, as discussed in chapter 3, two separate regression analyses were planned for. Following the trend in the literature, the first set of regression analyses considered the combined effects of mother's and father's parenting style. Because of the high intercorrelations among the types of parent involvement and parent's education (see Table 10), these first analyses also considered the combined effect of parent involvement and parent education.

Secondly, due to the low intercorrelations between parents' scores on the individual items, the second set of

analyses examined the independent effects of mother's and father's parenting style. During these analyses the independent effects of parent involvement and parent's education were also examined.

Four general linear models were constructed to test the first six null hypotheses proposed in this study. These null hypotheses were as follows:

1. There will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

2. There will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

3. There will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

4. There will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

5. There will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

6. There will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

Combined effects of the home variables. The first set of analyses examined the combined effects of the home variables in relation to a student's goal orientation. Model 1 of this analysis tested hypotheses 1, 3, and 5 concerning a student's mastery orientation. This analysis showed that there were no significant p-values for any of the variables (See Table 2). However, the variables of parental authoritativeness ($p < .0518$) and student ethnicity ($p < .0647$) were close, but not statistically significant. This model was only close to statistical significance ($F = 1.801$, $p < .0875$), however, and only accounted for 5% of the variance in student's mastery orientations.

Model 2 of these analyses tested hypotheses 2, 4, and 6 concerning a student's performance orientation. This analysis showed that there was only one significant p-value for parental authoritarianism ($p < .0001$) (see Table 2). In addition, parental authoritativeness ($p < .0763$) was close, but not statistically significant. This model was statistically significant ($F = 3.776$, $p < .0006$), but only accounted for 9% of the variance in student's performance orientation.

Independent effects of home variables. The second set of analyses examined the independent effects of the home variables relative to a student's goal orientation. Model 3

tested hypotheses 1, 3, and 5 concerning a student's mastery orientation. It showed the following variables were selected in the following order: mother's authoritativeness ($p < .0065$), student ethnicity ($p < .0449$), parental attendance of school programs ($p < .0141$), and parental attendance at sports or other extracurricular activities ($p < .0831$) (see Table 3). This model was statistically significant, but only accounted for 8% of the variance in student mastery orientation ($F = 5.22$, $p < =.0005$).

Model 4 tested hypotheses 2, 4 , and 6 concerning a student's performance orientation. It showed the following variables were selected in the following order: father's authoritarianism ($p < .0001$), parents' helping with student's homework ($p < .0066$), father's authoritativeness ($p < .0142$), and father's permissiveness ($p < .1405$) (see Table 4). This model was statistically significant, but only accounted for 12% of the variance in students' scores on the performance orientation scale ($F = 8.34$, $p < =.0001$). Through both of these stepwise procedures, there were no abrupt changes to respective independent variables as new variables were added in.

The findings that only mother's style was selected for the mastery orientation and only father's style was selected for the performance orientation were curious outcomes. Because of the sizable intercorrelations for mother's and father's parenting within each style (see Table 10), it was possible that the effects for the second parent were being

masked within each model. In other words, because the parent's scores were related, it might be that only the variable of the parent's style which explained the most variance was selected into the model. To analyze this possibility, another set of analyses were proposed. The independent effects of each home variable were examined without the stepwise selection procedure.

The results indicated, however, that the previously mentioned possibility was not the case (see Table 5). In other words, the second parent's scores were not being masked, they were simply not significantly related to the dependent variable. For a student's mastery orientation, again parents' attendance at school programs was statistically significant ($p < .0310$). However, mother's authoritativeness had a p-value very close to significance ($p < .0520$). For a student's performance orientation, father's authoritarianism ($p < .0013$) and parent's helping with student's homework ($p < .0148$) were statistically significant. Also, father's authoritativeness was once again related ($p < .0832$), but not significantly. Therefore, without the selection procedure, similar findings appeared. In particular, the distinctions between mother's and father's parenting were consistent across the analyses. (However, the effects that resulted from these analyses were not as strong as those from the original stepwise procedures. This could be due to the high rate of intercorrelations among the home variables.)

Demographic groups. Thirdly, separate regression analyses, using general models 1 and 2, were performed for (a) males, (b) females, (c) Caucasians, and (d) African Americans in order to test hypothesis 7. (Separate regressions were not analyzed for Hispanic and Asian students because these students were underrepresented in this sample.) This null hypothesis was:

7. There will be no differences among students of varying ethnicity and gender when looking at the relationship between goal orientation and parenting style.

For males (see Table 6), model 1 showed that there were no statistically significant p-values for any of the variables in relation to a mastery orientation. The variables of parent involvement ($p < .0679$) and parent education ($p < .0928$) were close, but not statistically significant. However, this model was not statistically significant ($F = 1.707$, $p < 1337$) and accounted for 14% of the variance in males' mastery orientation.
For males in model 2, there were also no statistically significant p-values for any of the variables. However, parents' authoritarianism ($p < .0904$) was close, but not statistically significant. This model was only close to statistical significance ($F = 1.971$, $p< .0828$), and accounted for 16% of the variance in males' performance orientation.

For females (see Table 7), model 1 showed that student ethnicity ($p < .0465$) was the only statistically significant

p-value in relation to a mastery orientation. However, authoritativeness ($p < .0690$) was close, but not statistically significant. This model was not statistically significant ($F = 1.495$, $p < .1821$) and only accounted for 5% of the variance in females' mastery orientation. Model 2 for females, showed that both parental authoritarianism ($p < .0001$) and permissiveness ($p < .0282$) were statistically significantly related to a performance orientation. In addition, parent involvement ($p < .0730$) was close, but not statistically significant. This model was statistically significant ($F = 3.983$, $p < .0009$), but only accounted for 12% of the variance in females' performance orientation.

For Caucasians (see Table 8), model 1 showed that parental authoritativeness ($p < .0417$) was the only significant p-value in relation to a mastery orientation. This model was not statistically significant ($F = 1.385$, $p < .2223$), and it only accounted for 4% of the variance in student's mastery orientation among Caucasians. With model 2, the only statistically significant p-value was for parental authoritarianism ($p < .0001$) in relation to a performance orientation. This model was statistically significant ($F = 3.869$, $p < .0011$), and accounted for 11% of the variance in student's performance orientation among Caucasians.

For African Americans (see Table 9), model 1 resulted in parental authoritarianism ($p < .0468$) as the only significant p-value in relation to a mastery orientation.

This model was not statistically significant ($F = 1.576$, $p < .2428$), yet accounted for 46% of the variance in student's mastery orientation among African Americans. For model 2, parental authoritativeness ($p < .0053$) was the only significant p-value in relation to a performance orientation. Student gender was close ($p < .0580$), but not statistically significant. This model was statistically significant ($F = 3.177$, $p <.0463$), and it accounted for 63% of the variance in student's performance orientation among African Americans.

Finally, an inspection of residual plots revealed no apparent violation of the assumptions of normality, homeoscedasticity, or linearity. Based on the method of data collection, the assumption of independence should also not be violated. Given the intercorrelations of parent variables provided on Table 10, multicollinearity should not be a problem. Therefore, multiple regression analysis is an appropriate approach for this study.

Results of Regression Analyses

The multiple regression analyses have resulted in the rejection of six of the seven null hypotheses proposed in this study. Hypotheses 1 through 6 tested the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation across ethnic and gender groups.

Hypothesis 1 states that there will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent

education are included in the regression model. When tested using the combined and independent effects of the home variables through multiple regression analyses, no statistical significance was found. Therefore, this hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 2 states that there will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are included in the regression model. Multiple regression analysis of the combined home variables result in the rejection of this hypothesis (see Table 2). In addition, when considering the independent effects of each parent, father's authoritarianism was significantly related to a student's performance orientation (see Tables 4 and 5). Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 3 states that there will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are included in the regression model. While the analysis examining the combined effects of the home variables did not result in this variable being of statistical significance, it was close (see Table 2). When considering the separate effects of each parent, mother's authoritativeness was significantly correlated with student's mastery orientation (see Tables 3 and 5). Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 4 states that there will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are included in the regression model. Multiple regression analysis of the combined effects of the home variables indicated that this relationship was close, but not statistically significant (see Table 2). When examining the independent effects of the home variables, father's authoritative parenting was related to a performance orientation when the independent effects of each parent were examined (see Table 4). Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 5 states there will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are included in the regression model. When tested using the multiple regression analyses for both combined and independent effects of the home variables, no statistical significance was found. Therefore, this hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 6 states that there will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are included in the regression model. Upon analysis of the combined effects of the home variables, this relationship was not significant. However, when considering the separate effects of each parent, father's

permissiveness was the significantly related to student's performance orientation (see Table 4). Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

Finally, hypothesis 7 states that there will be no differences among students of varying gender and ethnicity when looking at the relationship between goal orientation and parenting style. Therefore, the following results are based on separate analyses for each gender and ethnic group.

For females, both authoritarian and permissive parenting were significantly related to a performance orientation, and authoritativeness came close to significance in relation to a mastery orientation (see Table 7). In contrast, there was no home variable that was significantly related to goal orientation for males (see Table 6). For males, the strongest relationship to mastery orientation was in relation to parent involvement and parent education. The authoritarian parenting style did have the strongest correlation to males' performance orientation.

With regard to ethnicity, there is a clear distinction between African Americans and Caucasians with regard to the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation. For African Americans (see Table 9), parental authoritarianism is correlated with student's mastery orientation. (Because of this finding, the first hypothesis was also rejected.) Parental authoritativeness is correlated with student's performance orientation. For Caucasians, the reverse is true. Authoritativeness was

related to a mastery orientation; authoritarianism was related to a performance orientation (see Table 8). Therefore, hypothesis 1 an 7 were rejected.

Correlational Analyses

A correlational matrix was computed to examine the interrelationships among the various home variables (see Table 10). This matrix consisted of student's scores on the five types of parent involvement, mother's and father's scores on the three parenting styles, mother's and father's education, and student's mastery and performance orientations. The Pearson correlations indicate that all types of parent involvement are significantly intercorrelated (with a range of $r = .23$ to $r = 54$). In addition, father's and mother's education was also significantly correlated ($r = .47$). As mentioned in an earlier section, results showed that within each style, mother's and father's parenting style are intercorrelated. All types of parent involvement were significantly correlated with both (1) mother's authoritativeness, (2) father's authoritativeness, (3) father's education, and (4) mother's education. Finally, student's mastery and performance orientation were only weakly correlated ($r = .14$).

Summary

Overall, the findings in this study indicate the following relationships between parenting style and goal

orientation while taking into consideration the other home variables of parent involvement and parent education:

1. Parental authoritarianism is only related to a student's mastery orientation among African Americans.

2. Parental authoritarianism is consistently related to student's performance orientation. This relationship is evident when considering the combined effects of mother's and father's parenting styles. In addition, when considering separate effects of parents, father's authoritarianism in particular was significantly correlated with the performance orientation. However, this relationship is stronger among girls than boys. Finally, while this relationship holds up for Caucasians, it does not show up for African Americans.

3. Parental authoritativeness is consistently related to a student's mastery orientation. This relationship shows up when considering the combined effects of mother's and father's parenting style, and when considering the independent effects of mother's and father's parenting style, mother's authoritativeness in particular was related to a mastery orientation. However, this relationship is stronger among girls than boys and, this relationship exists for Caucasians but not African Americans.

4. Parental authoritativeness was found to be related to a performance orientation only when considering the separate effects of each parent, specifically father's authoritativeness was related to a performance orientation.

(Although this relationship is weaker than the relationship between father's authoritarianism and a performance orientation.) In addition, authoritativeness is related to an African American's performance orientation.

5. There was no relationship of statistical significance between parental permissiveness and student's mastery orientation.

6. Father's permissiveness was related to a student's performance orientation when considering the separate effects of parents. In addition, this relationship was stronger for females.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Parents' Scores on Subscales of the Parental Authority Questionnaire

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Mother's permissiveness	23.96	5.67
Mother's authoritarianism	29.55	7.54
Mother's authoritativeness	36.46	6.61
Father's permissiveness	24.14	6.48
Father's authoritarianism	32.89	8.63
Father's authoritativeness	34.10	7.15

Note. Lowest possible score on each scale is 10; highest score possible is 50.

Table 2

Multiple Regression
Combined Effects (General Model)

Model 1
Mastery Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.0589	.0650	.755	.4509
ATV	.1441	.0717	1.954	.0518
PERM	.0323	.0799	.439	.6613
PI	.0912	1.009	1.212	.2264
PE	.0663	.3755	.991	.3227
GEND	.0543	.7771	.875	.3823
ETH	.1189	.3392	1.855	.0647

$R^2 = .05$

Model 2
Performance Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.3381	.0433	4.448	.0001
ATV	.1280	.0477	1.780	.0763
PERM	.0857	.0532	1.193	.2339
PI	.0868	.6725	1.183	.2378
PE	-.0141	.2501	-.216	.8289
GEND	.0816	.5176	1.347	.1791
ETH	-.0490	.2259	-.784	.4335

$R^2 = .09$

* Standardized Slope

Table 3

Multiple Regression
Independent Effects (Selection Procedure)

Model 3
Mastery Orientation

Step Prob>F	Var Ent/Rem	Number In	Partial R**2	Model R**2	C(p)	F
1 .0023	ATVM	1	.0351	.0351	3.8033	9.451
2 .0349	ETH	2	.0165	.0515	1.3361	4.496
3 .0622	PIB	3	.0127	.0643	-.1162	3.508
4 .0831	PIC	4	.0109	.0752	-1.072	.027

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATVM	.1784	.0574	2.746	.0065
PIB	.1790	.6803	2.472	.0141
PIC	-.1253	.6884	-1.740	.0831
ETH	.1232	.3237	2.015	.0449

* Standardized Slope

Table 4

Multiple Regression
Independent Effects (Selection Procedure)

Model 4
Performance Orientation

Step Prob>F	Var Ent/Rem	Number In	Partial R**2	Model R**2	C(p)	F
1 .0001	ATNF	1	.0543	.0543	8.8481	14.919
2 .0016	PIA	2	.0357	.0900	.7775	10.163
3 .0236	ATVF	3	.0179	.1079	-2.283	5.182
4 .1405	PERMF	4	.0075	.1154	-2.406	2.186

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATVF	.1688	.0369	2.470	.0142
PERMF	.1112	.0446	1.479	.1405
ATNF	.3839	.0374	4.640	.0001
PIA	.1668	.4672	2.738	.0066

* Standardized Slope

Table 5

Multiple Regression
Independent Effects (Nonselection Procedure)

Mastery Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATVM	.1579	.0714	1.953	.0520
ATVF	.0112	.0674	.132	.8954
PERMM	-.0417	.0911	-.455	.6498
PERMF	.0783	.0862	.788	.4316
ATNM	-.0776	.0703	-.819	.4138
ATNF	.1538	.0704	1.447	.1491
PIA	-.0071	.8020	-.100	.9205
PIB	.1739	.7529	2.170	.0310
PIC	-.1277	.7490	-1.630	.1044
PID	.0173	.5638	.222	.8246
PIE	.0860	1.0070	1.188	.2359
FE	.0448	.3542	.591	.5552
ME	.0419	.3682	.570	.5689
ETH	.1055	.3446	1.620	.1064
GEND	.0309	.7824	.494	.6215

Performance Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATVM	.0160	.0478	.202	.8401
ATVF	.1458	.0452	1.740	.0832
PERMM	.0440	.0610	.489	.6253
PERMF	.0668	.0577	.685	.4938
ATNM	.0774	.0471	.833	.4059
ATNF	.3400	.0471	3.262	.0013
PIA	.1720	.5373	2.455	.0148
PIB	.0575	.5043	.732	.4650
PIC	-.0924	.5017	-1.203	.2301
PID	-.0054	.3777	-.071	.9438
PIE	.0028	.6746	.322	.7478
FE	-.0429	.2373	-.577	.5642
ME	.0477	.2467	.664	.5075
ETH	-.0387	.2308	-.607	.5447
GEND	.0626	.5241	1.022	.3077

* Standardized Slope

Table 6

Multiple Regression
Males

Model 1
Mastery Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.1037	.1335	.713	.4782
ATV	.1310	.1442	.914	.3642
PERM	-.1202	.1509	-.881	.3819
PI	.2657	2.0432	1.857	.0679
PE	.2212	.6948	1.706	.0928
ETH	-.0345	.7098	-.286	.7760

$R^2 = .14$

Model 2
Performance Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.2472	.0912	.171	.0904
ATV	.2071	.0985	1.461	.1490
PERM	-.1875	.1031	-1.388	.1700
PI	-.1723	1.3967	-1.217	.2279
PE	-.0773	.4749	-.603	.5488
ETH	.0942	.4852	.789	.4332

$R^2 = .16$

* Standardized Slope

Table 7

Multiple Regression
Females

Model 1
Mastery Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.0703	.0758	.751	.4534
ATV	.1596	.0834	1.836	.0690
PERM	.1037	.0943	1.831	.2392
PI	.0327	1.1914	.361	.7189
PE	.0157	.4555	.197	.8440
ETH	.1542	.3935	2.004	.0465

$R^2 = .05$

Model 2
Performance Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.3822	.0497	4.236	.0001
ATV	.1277	.0546	1.525	.1289
PERM	.1870	.0618	2.212	.0282
PI	.1578	.7809	1.803	.0730
PE	.0147	.2985	.192	.8481
ETH	-.0696	.2579	-.939	.3490

$R^2 = .11$

* Standardized Slope

Table 8

Multiple Regression
Caucasians

Model 1
Mastery Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.0279	.0758	.312	.7554
ATV	.1769	.0907	2.050	.0417
PERM	.0513	.0939	.627	.5314
PI	.0513	1.2371	.621	.5354
PE	.0442	.4529	.609	.5443
GEND	.0161	.8910	.228	.8197

$R^2 = .04$

Model 2
Performance Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.3387	.0482	3.917	.0001
ATV	.1288	.0578	1.546	.1237
PERM	.0279	.0597	.353	.7248
PI	.1103	.7868	1.383	.1683
PE	-.0019	.2880	-.027	.9781
GEND	.0957	.5666	1.403	.1621

$R^2 = .11$

* Standardized Slope

Table 9

Multiple Regression
African Americans

Model 1
Mastery Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.7261	.3279	2.238	.0468
ATV	-.0303	.2700	-.086	.9328
PERM	-.0675	.3569	-.220	.8302
PI	.1358	4.6859	.380	.7114
PE	.2379	1.7301	.681	.5100
GEND	-.2820	6.4846	-.762	.4619

$R^2 = .46$

Model 2
Performance Orientation

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Slope*	Std Err	T	p
ATN	.3493	.2121	1.306	.2183
ATV	1.0047	.1746	3.464	.0053
PERM	.4494	.2308	1.772	.1041
PI	-.4029	3.0309	-1.365	.1995
PE	-.1929	1.1191	-.669	.5171
GEND	-.6455	4.1944	-2.115	.0580

$R^2 = .63$

* Standardized Slope

Table 10

Correlations among Parent and Goal Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. PIA	1							
2. PIB	.33*	1						
3. PIC	.34*	.54*	1					
4. PID	.40*	.45*	.41*	1				
5. PIE	.23*	.40*	.37*	.37*	1			
6. ATNF	-.07	-.18	-.10	-.13	-.11	1		
7. ATNM	-.14	-.16	-.11	-.10	-.04	.40*	1	
8. PERMM	.03	.05	.03	-.04	-.09	-.17	-.56*	1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. PERMF	-.05	.02	-.10	-.07	-.04	-.60*	-.17	.46*
10.ATVF	.20	.33*	.30*	.31*	.34*	-.44*	-.05	-.07
11.ATVM	.34*	.36*	.32*	.28*	.31*	-.08	-.33*	.14
12.FE	-.23*	-.16	-.25*	-.36*	-.14	.06	.16	-.06
13.ME	-.26*	-.25*	-.13	-.28*	-.16	-.03	.05	-.02
14.MO	.07	.16	.03	.06	.14	.04	-.03	-.01
15.PO	.16	.07	.01	.09	.05	.21	.11	-.02

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
9. PERMF	1						
10.ATVF	.15	1					
11.ATVM	-.07	.43*	1				
12.FE	-.02	-.18	-.16	1			
13.ME	.06	-.09	-.22*	.47*	1		
14.MO	.00	.07	.19	.03	.01	1	
15.PO	-.11	.06	.09	.08	-.13	.14	1

* P = < .0001

Note. PIA = helping with homework; PIB = attending school programs; PIC = attending extracurricular programs; PID = helping select courses;PIE = knowledge of school progress; ATNF = father's authoritarianism; ATNM = mother's authoritarianism; PERMM = mother's permissiveness; PERMF = father's permissiveness; ATVF = father's authoritativeness; ATVM = mother's authoritativeness; FE = father's education; ME = mother's education; MO = mastery orientation; PO = performance orientation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among the three parenting styles and the mastery and performance goal orientations of undergraduate college students. The variables of parent involvement and parent education were included in these analyses for the purposes of controlling the effects of these variables on student goal orientations. In addition, student gender and ethnicity were also included in order to see whether the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation is different among various demographic groups.

The following questions were asked:

1. What relationships exist among Baumrind's three parenting styles and students' mastery and performance goal orientations when the effects of parent involvement and parent education are taken into account?

2. What differences exist among students of varying gender and ethnicity when looking at the relationship between goal orientation and parenting style?

Following from these research questions, the null hypotheses of this study were as follows:

1. There will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

2. There will be no relationship between an authoritarian parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

3. There will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

4. There will be no relationship between an authoritative parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

5. There will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's mastery orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

6. There will be no relationship between a permissive parenting style and a student's performance orientation when parent involvement and parent education are controlled.

7. There will be no differences among students of varying gender and ethnicity when looking at the relationship between goal orientation and parenting style.

Methodology

The sample for this study consisted of 311 undergraduates who attend the University of Florida and who were enrolled in either a course offered by the College of Education or the Psychology Department. Students completed a questionnaire that was a combination of the Goals Inventory (Roedel, Schraw, & Plake, 1994) and the Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991). This questionnaire was given out during a scheduled class period, and students were allowed to take it home to complete. Students were offered an extra credit incentive for their participation in this study. Confidentiality was assured because participants' responses were anonymous. When students returned the questionnaires, they were asked to provide their names and social security numbers on a sign-in sheet that was immediately given to the course instructor in order to distribute extra credit.

Results

While mother's and father's scores were significantly correlated within each parenting style, individual correlations calculated between parents for items on the Parental Authority Questionnaire were significant, but lower than expected. However, two separate regression analyses were performed. Following the trend in the literature, the first set of regression analyses considered the combined effects of mother's and father's parenting style. Because of the high intercorrelations among the types of parent

involvement and parent's education, these first analyses also considered the combined effect of parent involvement and parent education. Secondly, due to the low intercorrelations between parent's scores on the individual items, the second set of analyses examined the independent effects of mother's and father's parenting style. During these analyses, the independent effects of parent involvement and parent's education were also examined. The following results are based on these analyses.

Parental authoritarianism is only related to a student's mastery orientation among African Americans.

Parental authoritarianism is consistently related to student's performance orientation. This relationship is evident when considering the combined effects of mother's and father's parenting styles. In addition, when considering separate effects of parents, father's authoritarianism in particular was significantly correlated with the performance orientation. However, this relationship is stronger among girls than boys. Finally, while this relationship holds up for Caucasians, it does not show up for African Americans.

Parental authoritativeness is consistently related to a student's mastery orientation. This relationship shows up when considering the combined effects of mother's and father's parenting style, and when considering the independent effects of mother's and father's parenting style, mother's authoritativeness in particular was related

to a mastery orientation. However, this relationship is stronger among girls than boys and, this relationship exists for Caucasians but not African Americans.

Parental authoritativeness was found to be related to a performance orientation only when considering the separate effects of each parent, specifically father's authoritativeness was related to a performance orientation. (Although this relationship is weaker than the relationship between father's authoritarianism and a performance orientation.) In addition, authoritativeness is related to an African American's performance orientation.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between parental permissiveness and student's mastery orientation.

Parental permissiveness was related to a student's performance orientation when considering the separate effects of parents. Specifically, father's permissiveness was correlated with the performance orientation. In addition, this parenting style was related to females' (not males') performance orientation.

Based on the previous conclusions, there are differences among student's of varying gender and ethnicity when looking at the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation.

Due to the inclusion of many home variables in these analyses, the correlations among the (a) parenting styles, (b) each type of parent involvement, and (c) both parent's

education were examined. This analysis indicated that all types of parent involvement are interrelated and father's and mother's education are correlated also. Parenting style of mother and father are also intercorrelated. In addition, all types of parent involvement were correlated with: mother's and father's authoritativeness, and father's and mother's education.

Conclusions

Before any conclusions can be drawn from this study, the degree of generalizability of this research must be taken into consideration. First, results of this study are based on a sample of undergraduates from the University of Florida. On average, undergraduates admitted to this university have a high school grade point average of 3.6 to 4.2. and a Scholastic Aptitude Test Total Score of 1200 to 1360. The undergraduate catalogue stipulates that ninety percent of students entering as freshmen, rank above the national average on standard entrance exams. The university is one of the top five public universities in the number of enrolled National Merit and Achievement Scholars. Therefore, students who attend the university represent a group of academically advanced individuals. In addition, the racial breakdown of these students is 79% White, 9% Hispanic, 6% African American, and 6% Asian. While remaining aware of these limitations to generalizability, the following conclusions can be made.

Authoritarian Parenting

Parental authoritarianism was related to a student's performance orientation. Specifically, results indicated that parenting which emphasizes obedience, absolute conformity, and more punitive measures of discipline management tends to be related to a motivational orientation where students are concerned with proving their ability and winning approval. The finding that parental authoritarianism is related to this performance orientation was expected based on relevant past research.

In particular, Ginsburg and Bronstein (1993) found that the authoritarian parenting style was related to an extrinsic motivational orientation (a construct which is related to the performance goal orientation). These students tended to be rated by teachers as showing less persistence, motivation, and satisfaction with schoolwork.

In general, researchers have found that, in comparison to the authoritative parenting style, the authoritarian parenting style is more likely to be correlated with student's who have lower aspirations for competent work performance, less capacity to experience pleasure in work, and are more dependent upon others (Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). Even in some of the early research, authoritarian parenting has been correlated with the following child behaviors: dependence on authority figures, lacks

initiative, and tendency to withdraw from exploratory and challenging academic situations (Baumrind, 1967, 1970, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

When considering the separate effects of parenting style, it was father's authoritarianism in particular which correlated with the performance orientation. Because the bulk of the parenting literature considers the joint effect of parents, this finding is hard to interpret based on previous research. However, it seems to indicate that it might be that the risk of students adopting a performance orientation is greater if it is the father, rather than the mother, who is authoritarian.

In addition, the relationship between authoritarianism and a performance orientation is stronger among girls than boys. This was not a completely unexpected finding. Steinberg, Elmen, and Mounts (1989) informally examined the variable of gender and concluded that the positive impact of parental acceptance appears stronger for girls than boys, and for boys the positive impact of behavioral control is stronger. Other researchers have found similar findings (Nutall & Nutall 1976). In contrast, other research indicates the positive benefits of authoritative parenting cut across gender groups (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992).

Based on the findings in this study, however, it might be that females are more susceptible to the negative consequences of authoritarian parenting. "Boys and girls are affected somewhat differently by authoritarian practices, with independence in girls. . . most adversely affected by such practices" (Baumrind, 1971, p. 100).

There was an additional interesting distinction that appeared when considering Caucasians and African Americans separately. While authoritarianism was related to a performance orientation for Caucasian students, this style of parenting correlated with a mastery orientation for African Americans. These findings were expected based on previous research.

Research has shown that African Americans may not benefit from the authoritative construct like Caucasian students (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). It has been hypothesized that "minority youngsters-especially those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds-may benefit from a relatively more authoritarian style of parenting" and "authoritarianism maybe more beneficial among families whose living circumstances warrant stricter, more vigilant control" (Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). Therefore the findings of the present study corroborate this possibility.

Authoritative Parenting

Authoritative parenting was related to a mastery orientation. Based on this study's findings, parents who are more likely to explain rules, place less emphasis on strict obedience, and who emphasize autonomy tend to have children who are more concerned with improving ability and attaining personal mastery.

Based on the previous research discussed throughout this study, this was an expected finding. Consistently, authoritative parenting was related to a healthy work orientation or self-reliance and ability to experience pleasure in work (Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). This style of parenting has also been associated with an intrinsic motivational style (Ginsburg & Bronstein, 1993). Even the early research corroborates these findings in that authoritative parenting was associated with children who were self-reliant, explorative, and tended to approach challenge (Baumrind, 1967).

Further, the authoritative parenting style predicted student motivational orientation more than levels of parent involvement. This finding contrasts some of the previously stated research which has indicated less of an influence for the authoritative parenting style, in comparison to levels of parent involvement, in accounting for these positive

motivational behaviors (Paulson, 1994; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling (1992).

When examining the separate effects for each parent, it was mother's authoritativeness that was more significantly related to a student's mastery orientation. However, other research has also shown the weighty influence of mother's authoritativeness in relation to predicting undergraduates' self-esteem scores (Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, & Mueller, 1988).

In addition, the relationship between authoritativeness and a mastery orientation was stronger among girls than boys. Research has shown that parenting style (specifically mother's authoritativeness) in the home may be more influential in the development of self-esteem of girls then boys (Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, & Mueller, 1988). Pipher, in her book Reviving Ophelia, states, "in my experience, strong daughters often come from families with strong mothers" (p. 117). Therefore, this study's findings corroborate this belief. If the mastery orientation is the more adaptive of the two goal orientations, it was mother's, and not father's, authoritativeness which correlated with this more adaptive motivational orientation.

In addition, while the authoritative style is associated with a mastery orientation among Caucasians, for African Americans, authoritative parenting was related to a performance orientation. This finding was partly explained in the section on parental authoritarianism. However, this

additional finding appears to further corroborate the belief that African Americans may benefit from stricter styles of parenting. However, while Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, and Dornbusch (1994) discuss the possibility that this demographic group may benefit from authoritarianism, they have also concluded that authoritative parenting has not itself proven detrimental to any demographic groups. Given the overall nonadaptive achievement behaviors associated with the performance orientation, this study is unique in indicating the authoritative style may in fact be detrimental to achievement behaviors among African Americans specifically.

One very unexpected finding was that father's authoritativeness was also related to a student's performance orientation. It is hard to account for this finding given that research is just now beginning to tease apart the differential effects for each parent. However, it must be kept in mind that this relationship was not as significant as that between father's authoritarianism and a student's performance orientation. Clearly, this is an area that further research could help to illuminate.

Permissive Parenting

In general, the effects for parental permissiveness were lower than expected. Based on previous research, this parenting style has been related to an extrinsic motivational orientation (Ginsburg & Bronstein, 1993). Research has indicated that permissive parenting (for both

indulgent and neglectful types) is related with some of the poorest outcomes on measures of work-orientation and self-reliance (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). The negative outcomes associated with a permissive style were also expected given that of the three parenting styles, permissive parenting held the lowest relationship with parents' involvement in their child's public school education.

Even early research has shown that parental permissiveness is related to performance oriented motivational behaviors like: low self-reliance, low tolerance for frustration, and low persistence in the face of difficulty (Baumrind, 1967, 1970, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). However, in the study on self-esteem conducted with undergraduate college age students mentioned earlier, parental permissiveness was unrelated to student's self-esteem.

Yet some interesting findings became apparent upon examining the separate effects of parenting style. Father's permissiveness was related to a student's performance orientation. This finding underscores the importance of examining the separate effects of each parent when conducting this research. Otherwise, it would have been inappropriately concluded that permissive parenting is unrelated to undergraduate students' goal orientations. However, it is unclear from previous research as to why

father's, more than mother's, permissiveness is related with a student's performance orientation.

One possible explanation may be that mother's permissiveness is not as detrimental to a student's motivational orientation due to traditional beliefs concerning mother's and father's roles of authority in the household. Traditionally, mothers are seen as more nuturant. "Mothers are typically seen as more affectionate, warmer, and less strict. This is not surprising given that mothers are the ones who feed, wash, and clothe children - in other words, who nurture them" (Lefrancois, 1996, p. 177). Thus from a sociological standpoint, it may be that mother's permissiveness is not as detrimental to a student's goal orientation because mother's permissiveness may be expected as part of the definition of the mother's role in the household.

In particular, permissive parenting also was related to females' (not males') performance orientation. This is a very interesting finding and also is difficult to interpret based on previous research. One possible explanation may also be rooted in sociological theory. Pipher (1994) discusses that during adolescence, daughters are struggling to individuate and may resist the protection of the mother. In contrast, for males this process of individuation starts much earlier (Gilligan, 1993).

Overall, based on the stronger correlation among parenting style and females' goal orientations found among

all three parenting styles, it appears that parenting style is a stronger source of influence for females' goal orientations in comparison to males' goal orientations.

Parental permissiveness did not emerge as a significant predictor of goal orientation when examining the relationship between parenting style and goal orientation for Caucasians and African Americans separately. Statistically, this is not surprising given that the relationships between permissiveness and goal orientation were weaker than expected.

Parent Involvement and Parent Education

While these variables were not a focus of this study but included to control their effects, they will also be discussed.

Parent involvement. Parent involvement failed to be related to goal orientation when considering the combined influence of the five types of parental involvement. This was unexpected given the wealth of research indicated a strong relationship between parent involvement and student academic success. "Across a range of studies, there has emerged a strong conclusion that parental involvement in child and adolescent education generally benefits children's learning and school success (e.g. Chavkin, 1993; Eccles & Harold, 1993; Epstein, 1989, 1991, 1994; Hess & Holloway, 1984; Hobbs et al., 1984; U.S. Department of Education, 1994)" (Hoover-Dempsey & Sander, 1997, p. 3).

However, due to the high correlations between parental involvement and authoritative parenting found, perhaps the effectiveness of authoritative parenting in explaining the variance in student goal orientation has masked the influence of parent involvement. While not using a motivational measure, Paulson's (1994) results also indicated a high correlation between parent involvement and authoritative parenting. However, results of Paulson's study indicated that parental involvement predicted achievement "above and beyond dimensions of parenting styles". Other researchers have also discussed parent involvement as a mediational influence between parenting style and school performance or engagement (Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling (1992). The present study, however, has shown that parenting style explained more of the variance in motivational orientation than the variable of parent involvement.

However, some interesting relationships did show up once the different types of involvement were examined separately. Parental attendance at school programs and extracurricular events were significantly related to a mastery orientation. However, parents helping with student's homework was related to a performance orientation. This latter finding is very interesting. In fact, Ames (1992) has concluded that students may be oriented toward different goals and patterns of motivation depending on the nature of evaluation. Product-oriented learning focuses on

the quantity of learning. Specifically, "the high visibility of these products orients children away from the task of learning. This product orientation soon shifts to a performance orientation when correctness, absence of errors, and normative success are emphasized" (p. 264).

Therefore, perhaps helping their children to complete these homework assignments in some way emphasizes to the child the appropriateness of working for external reinforcers that are offered through external evaluation. In fact, Ginsburg and Bronstein (1993) also concluded that parental surveillance of homework was related with children being dependent on external source to guide and evaluate their behavior. These children showed less initiation, persistence, and satisfaction in doing their work.

A curious finding concerning parent involvement relates to the gender distinction that was talked about previously. Parent involvement was more related to a mastery orientation for males, and for females was more related to a performance orientation. No research was located which could help account for these findings.

Parent education. The variable of parental educational attainment failed to be related to goal orientation in initial analyses. However, when considering the difference between males and females discussed earlier an interesting distinction became apparent. Parental education was more related to a mastery orientation for males then any parenting style when considering combined mother's and

father's education. In no other instance was parental education related to goal orientation, even when considering the separate effects of parent's education.

Previous research on the effects of parent education on student achievement has led to mixed results. Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown (1992) emphasize the "strong association between parental social class and scholastic success in the sociological literature on status attainment" (p. 725). Other researchers have supported this strong association (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Wang, Wildman, & Calhoun, 1996).

Yet, Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, and Dornbusch (1991) failed to find an interaction between students with parents of varying parental education. Other researchers have also commented on the low correlations between parents education and achievement (McCartin & Meyer, 1988).

Concluding Remarks

While many of the expected relationships appeared, some of the relationships were smaller than expected. This was not a completely unexpected finding given some of the previous research. Weiss and Schwarz (1996) and Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, and Dornbusch (1991) report finding a smaller magnitude of effects with older aged students. However, their findings support that the parenting style framework can be applied to older college aged students and still result in many of the expected relationships between parenting style and academic behavior.

In addition, the overall utility of the home variables in accounting for the variance in student goal orientation was low. There are many additional factors that will influence a student's goal orientation. For instance the nature of classroom tasks and activities, ways in which students are evaluated, and students' perceived choice and decision-making have all been discussed as structures in the classroom that influence students' goal orientation (Ames, 1992). In addition, students' self-efficacy and perceived control influence students' intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Perhaps by including some of these factors, in addition to just home variables, would lead to more efficient models.

The noticeably increased utility of the models performed specifically for African Americans was very curious and hard to explain. Perhaps, in general, home variables are more influential on goal orientations for African Americans.

In any event, many of the expected relationships between parenting styles and students' goal orientations were significant and in the expected direction. This indicates that the influence of parenting styles on undergraduate students' goal orientations is apparent and worthy of further consideration.

Future Directions

Several areas for future research are proposed based on this study's findings.

1. Relating to the overall utility of the model used, perhaps by employing other variables into the models, in addition to the home variables used in this study, would increase the efficiency of the models for predicting student goal orientation.

2. Replications of this research should include the indulgent/neglectful distinction of the permissive parenting style. Research has been done which has indicated the need to distinguish between these two types of parenting styles (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994).

3. Research should also provide for a large enough sample to analyze the nature of these relationship with Asian and Hispanic students. Unfortunately, the subsamples of these ethnic groups were too small to formally analyze in this study. However, recent research has discussed whether the traditional findings concerning the influence of parenting style on academic behaviors can be applied to these groups (Chao, 1994; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992).

4. Given the gender differences that resulted in this study, additional research should further examine the separate effects for males and females.

5. Due to the many findings distinguishing effects for each parent, future research should analyze the separate effects of mother's and father's parenting. Also, research should investigate any differential effects that may arise when one parent's style is more dominant in the household. Further, the actual independence of these parenting styles needs to be clarified before confidently making conclusions about differential effects for each style on student behavior.

6. Future research also needs to examine the differential effects of parenting style on single parent versus intact families.

7. In general, because the literature indicates that little research has examined the relationship between parenting style and student's goal orientation, studies of this kind should be replicated with students of other ages.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

Project Title: The relationships between students' home backgrounds and undergraduate academic performance

Please read this document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study:
The purpose of this study is to assess relationships between students' home backgrounds and academic performance in college.

What you will be asked to do in this study:
You will be asked to complete the attached questionnaire. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

Time Required:
Thirty Minutes

Risks:
None

Benefits/Compensation:
You will receive three points of extra credit added to your total grade for this course. When you return the completed questionnaire you will be asked to write your name and social security number on a separate sign-in sheet to receive your extra credit.

Confidentiality:
Participants' responses will be anonymous. The sign-in sheet will immediately be given to the course instructor in order to distribute extra credit. Students will not identify themselves on the informed consent or questionnaire. Therefore. the investigator will not be able to link the participant to their responses on the questionnaire.

Voluntary participation:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating. You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about this study:
Alyssa Gonzalez. Graduate Student, Department of Foundations of Education,
1403 Norman Hall. 392-0726, Ext. 282.
Dr. Gordon Greenwood, Professor of Education. Department of Foundations of Education.
1403 Norman Hall. 392-0723. Ext. 233.

Whom to contact about your rights in this study:
UFIRB Office, Box 112250, University of Florida. Gainesville, FL. 32611-2250; phone: 392-0433.

Principal Investigator: Alyssa Gonzalez Alyssa Gonzalez

Approved by the
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board
(IRB 02) for use through
APR 06 1999

APPENDIX B
HOME SCHOOL INVENTORY

Home - School Inventory

This instrument is designed to assess relationships between students' home backgrounds and academic performance in college. The results of this study might be useful to future instructors and advisors in discerning student achievement problems. Your frank and honest opinion is critical to the success of this research investigation. There are no correct or incorrect responses. No names or social security numbers will be identified in reporting the results of this study. Thank you for your participation!

Please complete the following items by checking the appropriate circle:

1. Gender
   ( )Male ( )Female

2. Ethnicity
   ( )Caucasian ( )Hispanic ( )Asian ( )African American ( )Other

3. Class Standing
   ( )Graduate ( )Undergraduate ( )Other

4. Father's Education
   ( )Graduate/Professional Degree ( )Four year college degree ( )Some college or vocational/trade school ( )high school graduate
   ( )not a high school graduate ( )don't know

5. Mother's Education
   ( )Graduate/Professional Degree ( )Four year college degree ( )Some college or vocational/trade school ( )high school graduate
   ( )not a high school graduate ( )don't know

Please complete the following items by filling in the blank as indicated:

6. Age: ____

7. Program of Study: _____

Please complete the following item by circling the number that best represents your choice using the following scale:

1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=usually

8. With what frequency were your parents involved in your education growing up?

a. helping with homework when asked	1	2	3
b. attending school programs	1	2	3
c. watching you in sports or other extracurricular activities	1	2	3
d. helping you select courses	1	2	3
e. knowing how you were doing in school	1	2	3

Please circle the number that best represents your choice using the following scale:
1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

1. I enjoy challenging school assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It is important for me to get better grades than my classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I persevere even when I am frustrated by a task.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Academic success is largely due to effort.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Sticking with a challenging task is rewarding.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I try even harder after I fail at something.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I adapt well to challenging circumstances.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I am willing to cheat to get a good grade.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I work hard even when I don't like class.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I am very determined to reach my goals.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Personal mastery of a subject is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I work very hard to improve myself.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I like others to think I know a lot.	1	2	3	4	5
14. It bothers me the whole day when I make a big mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I feel angry when I do not do as well as others.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I am naturally motivated to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I prefer challenging tasks even if I don't do as well at them.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Every student can learn to be a successful learner.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Learning can be judged best by the grade one gets.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My grades do not necessarily reflect how much I learn.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Mistakes are a healthy part of learning.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I feel most satisfied when I work hard to achieve something.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I would rather have people think I am lazy than stupid.	1	2	3	4	5
24. It is important to me to always do better than others.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I give up too easily when faced with a difficult task.	1	2	3	4	5

For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your mother. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your mother during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=undecided 4=agree 5=strongly agree

1. While I was growing up my **mother** felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Even if her children didn't agree with **her**, my **mother** felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what **she** thought was right. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Whenever my **mother** told me to do something as I was growing up, **she** expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions. 1 2 3 4 5

4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my **mother** discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

5. My **mother** has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable. 1 2 3 4 5

6. My **mother** has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds, and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want. 1 2 3 4 5

7. As I was growing up my **mother** did not allow me to question any decision that she had made. 1 2 3 4 5

8. As I was growing up my **mother** directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline. 1 2 3 4 5

9. My **mother** has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to. 1 2 3 4 5

10. As I was growing up my **mother** did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them. 1 2 3 4 5

11. As I was growing up I knew what my **mother** expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my **mother** when I felt that they were unreasonable. 1 2 3 4 5

12. My **mother** felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

13. As I was growing up, my **mother** seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Most of the time as I was growing up my **mother** did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions. 1 2 3 4 5

15. As the children in my family were growing up, my **mother** consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways. 1 2 3 4 5

16. As I was growing up my **mother** would get very upset if I tried to disagree with **her**. 1 2 3 4 5

17. My **mother** feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up. 1 2 3 4 5

18. As I was growing up, my **mother** let me know what behavior **she** expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, **she** punished me. 1 2 3 4 5

19. As I was growing up my **mother** allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from **her**. 1 2 3 4 5

20. As I was growing up my **mother** took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but **she** would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it. 1 2 3 4 5

21. My **mother** did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up. 1 2 3 4 5

22. My **mother** had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but **she** was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

23. My **mother** gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and **she** expected me to follow **her** direction, but **she** was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me. 1 2 3 4 5

24. As I was growing up my **mother** allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and **she** generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do. 1 2 3 4 5

25. My **mother** has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up. 1 2 3 4 5

26. As I was growing up my **mother** often told me exactly what **she** wanted me to do and how **she** expected me to do it. 1 2 3 4 5

27. As I was growing up my **mother** gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but **she** was also understanding when I disagreed with **her**. 1 2 3 4 5

28. As I was growing up my **mother** did not direct the behaviors, activities and desires of the children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

29. As I was growing up I knew what my **mother** expected of me in the family and **she** insisted that I confirm to those expectations simply out of respect for **her** authority. 1 2 3 4 5

30. As I was growing up, if my **mother** made a decision in the family that hurt me, **she** was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if **she** had made a mistake. 1 2 3 4 5

For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your father. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your father during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1=strongly disagree 2=disagree 3=undecided 4=agree 5=strongly agree

1. While I was growing up my **father** felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Even if his children didn't agree with **him**, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what **he** thought was right. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Whenever my **father** told me to do something as I was growing up, **he** expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions. 1 2 3 4 5

4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my **father** discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

5. My **father** has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable. 1 2 3 4 5

6. My **father** has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds, and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want. 1 2 3 4 5

7. As I was growing up my **father** did not allow me to question any decision that he had made. 1 2 3 4 5

8. As I was growing up my **father** directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline. 1 2 3 4 5

9. My **father** has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to. 1 2 3 4 5

10. As I was growing up my **father** did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them. 1 2 3 4 5

11. As I was growing up I knew what my **father** expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my **father** when I felt that they were unreasonable. 1 2 3 4 5

12. My **father** felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

13. As I was growing up, my **father** seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Most of the time as I was growing up my **father** did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions. 1 2 3 4 5

15. As the children in my family were growing up, my **father** consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways. 1 2 3 4 5

16. As I was growing up my **father** would get very upset if I tried to disagree with **him**. 1 2 3 4 5

17. My **father** feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up. 1 2 3 4 5

18. As I was growing up, my **father** let me know what behavior **he** expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, **he** punished me. 1 2 3 4 5

19. As I was growing up my **father** allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from **him**. 1 2 3 4 5

20. As I was growing up my **father** took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but **he** would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it. 1 2 3 4 5

21. My **father** did not view himself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up. 1 2 3 4 5

22. My **father** had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but **he** was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

23. My **father** gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and **he** expected me to follow **his** direction, but **he** was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me. 1 2 3 4 5

24. As I was growing up my **father** allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and he generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do. 1 2 3 4 5

25. My **father** has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up. 1 2 3 4 5

26. As I was growing up my **father** often told me exactly what **he** wanted me to do and how **he** expected me to do it. 1 2 3 4 5

27. As I was growing up my **father** gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but **he** was also understanding when I disagreed with him. 1 2 3 4 5

28. As I was growing up my **father** did not direct the behaviors, activities and desires of the children in the family. 1 2 3 4 5

29. As I was growing up I knew what my **father** expected of me in the family and **he** insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for **his** authority. 1 2 3 4 5

30. As I was growing up, if my **father** made a decision in the family that hurt me, he was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if he had made a mistake. 1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX C
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Institutional Review Board

98A Psychology Bldg.
PO Box 112250
Gainesville, FL 32611-2250
(352) 392-0433
Fax (352) 392-0433

DATE: 06-Apr-98

TO: Ms. Alyssa Gonzalez
1403 NRN

FROM: C. Michael Levy, Chair
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board

SUBJECT: **Approval of Project #** 1998 - 305

TITLE: The relationships between students' home backgrounds and undergraduate academic performance.

FUNDING: Unfunded

I am pleased to advise you that the University of Florida Institutional Review Board has recommended approval of this project. Based on its review of your protocol, the UFIRB determined that this research presents no more than minimal risk to participants, and based of 45 CFR 46.117(c), authorizes you to administer the informed consent process as specified in the attached description.

If you wish to make any changes to this protocol, you must disclose your plans before you implement them so that the Board can assess their impact on your project. In addition, you must report to the Board any unexpected complications arising from the project that affect your participants.

If you have not completed this project by 06-Apr-99, please telephone our office (392-0433) and we will tell you how to obtain a renewal.

It is important that you keep your Department Chair informed about the status of this research project.

CML/h2

Cc: Vice President for Research
Dr. Gordon Greenwood

Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Institution

REFERENCES

Ainley, M.D. (1993). Styles of engagement with learning: Multidimensional assessment of their relationship with strategy use and school achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85(3), 395-405.

Ames, C. (1984). Achievement attributions and self-instructions under competitive and individualistic goal structures. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(3), 478-487.

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84(3), 261-271.

Ames, C. & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(3), 260-267.

Archer, J. (1994). Achievement goals as a measure of motivation in university students. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 19, 430-446.

Barrett, E.R., & Davis, S. (1995). Perceptions of beginning teachers' inservice needs in classroom management. Teacher Education and Practice, 11(1), 22-27.

Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75, 43-88.

Baumrind, D. (1970). Socialization and instrumental competence in young children. Young Children, 26(2), 104-119.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monograph, 4 (1 part 2). 1-103.

Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. Youth & Society, 9(3), 239-276.

Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In R.M. Lerner, A.C. Petersen, & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), Encyclopedia of adolescence: Vol. 2 (pp. 746-758). New York: Garland Publishing.

Baumrind, D., & Black, A.E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 38(2), 291-327.

Blumenfeld, P.C. (1992). Classroom learning and motivation: Clarifying and expanding goal theory. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84(3), 272-281.

Buri, J.R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. Journal of Personality Assessment, 57(1), 110-119.

Buri, J.R., Louiselle, P.A., Misukanis, T.M., & Mueller, R.A. (1988). Effects of parental authoritarianism and authoritativeness on self-esteem. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14(2), 271-282.

Chao, R.K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. Child Development, 65, 1111-1119.

Cohen, D.A. (1991). Overcoming student apathy and bewilderment: Setting an example of responsibility and attentiveness. Proteus, 8(1), 27-29.

Connell, J.P. (1985). A new multidimensional measure of children's perception of control. Child Development, 56, 1018-1041.

Connell, J.P., & Ryan, R.M. (1986). Manual for the ASRQ: A theory and assessment of children's self-regulation within the academic domain. Unpublished manuscript, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.

Crane, J. (1996). Effects of home environment, SES, and maternal test scores on mathematics achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 89(5), 305-314.

Cubbison, P. (1993, December). A is for apathy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, San Francisco, CA.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

Diener, C.I., & Dweck, C.S. (1978). An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36(5), 451-462.

Dornbusch, S.M., Ritter, P.L., Leiderman, H., Roberts, D.F., & Fraleigh, M.J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. Child Development, 58, 1244-1257.

Dweck, C.S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. American Psychologist, 41(10), 1040-1048.

Dweck, C.S., & Leggett, E.L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. Psychological Review, 95(2), 256-273.

Elam, S.M. (1989). The second gallup/phi delta kappa poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(10), 785-798.

Elliott, E.S. & Dweck, C.S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54(1), 5-12.

Epstein, J.L. (1989). Family structures and student motivation: A developmental perspective. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education: Vol. 3. goals and cognitions. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.

Gilligan, C. (1993). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gimenez, M.E. (1989). Silence in the classroom: Some thoughts about teaching in the 1980's. Teaching Sociology, 17(2), 184-199.

Ginsburg, G.S., & Bronstein, P. (1993). Family factors related to children's intrinsic/extrinsic motivational orientation and academic performance. Child Development, 64, 1461-1474.

Greenberger, E., Josselson, R., Knerr, C., & Knerr, B. (1974). The measurement and structure of psychosocial maturity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 127-143.

Greenwood, G.E., & Hickman, C.W. (1991). Research and practice in parent involvement: Implications for teacher education. Elementary School Journal, 91(3), 279-288.

Grolnick, W.S., Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (1991). Inner resources for school achievement: Motivational mediators of children's perceptions of their parents. Journal of Educational Psychology, 83(4), 508-517.

Grolnick, W.S., & Ryan, R.M. (1989). Parent styles associated with children's self-regulation and competence in school. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81(2), 143-154.

Grolnick, W.S. & Ryan, R.M. (1992). Parental resources and the developing child in school. In Procidano, M.E. & Fischer, C.B. (Eds.), Contemporary families: A handbook for school professionals (pp. 275-291). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hagen, A.S. & Weinstein, C.E. (1995). Achievement goals, self-regulated learning, and the role of classroom context. In P.R. Pintrich (Ed.), New directions for teaching and learning (pp. 43-55). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Harter, S. (1980). A scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the classroom (Manual). University of Denver, Denver.

Harter, S. (1982). The perceived competence scale for children. Child Development, 53, 87-97.

Harter, S. (1985). Manual for the self-perception profile for children. Unpublished manuscript, University of Denver, Denver.

Hess, R.D., & Holloway, S.D. (1984). Family and school as educational institutions. In R.D. Parke (Ed.), Review of child development research: Vol. 7 (pp.179-222). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hoover-Dempsey, K.V., & Sandler, H.M. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? Review of Educational Research, 67(1), p. 3-42.

Jagacinski, C.M., & Nicholls, J.G. (1987). Competence and affect in task involvement and ego involvement: The impact of social comparison information. Journal of Educational Psychology, 79(2), 107-114.

Kelly, D.K. (1988). Motivating the underprepared unmotivated community college student. California. (ERIC Document Service No. ED299-009)

Lamborn, S.D., Brown, B.B., Mounts, N.S., & Steinberg, L. (1992). Putting school in perspective: The influence of family, peers, extracurricular participation, and part-time work on academic engagement. In F.M. Newmann (Ed.), Student engagement and achievement in american secondary schools (pp. 153-181). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lamborn, S.D., Mounts, N.S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S.M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. Child Development, 62, 1049-1065.

Lefrancois, G.R. (1996). The lifespan (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Maccoby, E.E. & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P.H. Mussen (Series Ed.)& E.M. Hetherington (Vol Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. socialization, personality, and social Development (4th ed., P.1-101). New York: Wiley.

Maslow, A.H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

McCartin, R., & Meyer, K.A. (1988). The adolescent, academic achievement, and college plans: The role of family variables. Youth and Society, 19(4), 378-394.

McDaniel, E.L. (1973). Inferred self-concept scale manual. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Meece, J.L., Blumenfeld, P.C., & Hoyle, R.H. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(4), 514-523.

Murray, H., Barrett, W.G., & Homburger, E. (1938). Explorations in personality: A clinical and experimental study of fifty men of college age. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nicholls, J.G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. Psychological Review, 91(3), 328-346.

Nutall, E.V., & Nutall, R.L. (1976). Parent-child relationships and effective academic motivation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Ormrod, J.E. (1995). Educational psychology: Principles and applications. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Paulson, S.E. (1994). Relations of parenting style and parental involvement with ninth-grade students' achievement. Journal of Early Adolescence, 14(2), 250-267.

Pintrich, P.R. & Garcia, T. (1991). Student goal orientation and self-regulation in the college classroom. In Advances in Motivation and Achievement: Vol.7. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Pipher, M. (1994). Reviving Ophelia. New York: Ballantine Books.

Rice, F.P. (1998). Human development (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rice, G.E. (1994). Purpose-in-life and developmental college students: An updated comparative study. Educational Research Quarterly, 17(2), 5-9.

Ritchie, R. (1990). Views of U.S. public school administrators on the status of U.S. public education and the role of corporate America. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED339-818)

Roedel, T.D., Schraw, G., & Plake, B.S. (1994). Validation of a measure of learning and performance goal orientations. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54(4), 1013-1021.

Ryan, R.M. & Connell, J.P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 749-761.

Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S.M., & Brown, B.B. (1992). Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement: An ecological perspective. American Psychologist, 47(6), 723-729.

Steinberg, L., Elmen, J.D., & Mounts, N.S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. Child Development, 60, 1424-1436.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S.D., Darling, N., Mounts, N.S., & Dornbusch, S.M. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. Child Development, 65, 754-770.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S.D., Dornbusch, S.M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. Child Development, 63, 1266-1281.

Stipek, D.J., & Kowalski, P.S. (1989). Learned helplessness in task-orienting versus performance-orienting testing conditions. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81(3), 384-391.

Wang, J., Wildman, L., & Calhoun, G. (1996). The relationships between parental influence and student achievement in seventh grade mathematics. School Science and Mathematics, 96(8), 395-399.

Weiss, L.H., & Schwarz, J.C. (1996). The relationship between parenting types and older adolescents' personality, academic achievement, adjustment, and substance use. Child Development, 67, 2101-2114.

Wentzel, K.R. (1989). Adolescent classroom goals, standards for performance, and academic achievement: An interactionist perspective. Journal of Educational Psychology, 81(2), 131-142.

White, K.R. (1982). The relation between socioeconomic status and academic achievement. Psychological Bulletin, 91(3), 461-481.

White, K.R., Taylor, M.J., & Moss, V.D. (1992). Does research support claims about the benefits of involving parents in early intervention programs? Review of Educational Research, 62(1), 91-125.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Alyssa Renee Gonzalez was born on February, 12, 1972, in Albany, New York. Shortly thereafter, she moved with her family to Florida where she has spent most of her life. Her parents have owned a successful air-conditioning company in central Florida for the past several years. She graduated from Bloomingdale High School, located in Valrico, Florida, in 1990.

Alyssa attended the University of Florida as an undergraduate where she received her Bachelor of Science degree in psychology in 1994. During her undergraduate program, she became interested in educational psychology. She soon joined the Foundations of Education Department in the College of Education as a doctoral graduate student. She completed her Master of Education degree in 1995.

During her graduate studies with the university, Alyssa taught both educational psychology and human development courses. She has received a Florida Graduate Minority Fellowship, from 1995 through 1998, based on her academic achievement. In addition, she was awarded the Multicultural Student Recognition Award in 1998 for her academic scholarship. In addition to her dissertation interests concerning parenting style and undergraduate students'

motivation, she also was involved in a collaborative project examining beginning teacher concerns of recent Proteach graduates. This latter study was funded through a grant offered by the Florida Educational Research Council (FERC).

Upon completion of her doctoral degree, Alyssa plans to move to Palm Beach Gardens, Florida, as an assistant professor of educational psychology with Florida Atlantic University. She is a member of the American Educational Research Association and plans to continue her teaching and research in the field of educational psychology. In particular, she plans to continue her work in home influences of student motivational orientations.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Gordon E. Greenwood, Chair
Professor of Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jin-Wen Y. Hsu
Assistant Professor of Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Barry J. Guinagh
Associate Professor of Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Greg J. Neimeyer
Professor of Psychology

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 1998

M. David Miller
Chairman, Foundations of Education

Robert J. McDavis
Dean, College of Education

Kenneth A. Holbrook
Dean, Graduate School